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## THEREUPON:

## JOEL SOLOMON,

being by me first duly sworn or affirmed to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as hereinafter certified, responded and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.
DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. GILLMAN:

Q. Mr. Solomon, I'm Steve Gillman and I think as you know I represent SP Fort Lauderdale Lender, LLC. I also represent SB Hotel Associates, LLC, but I am taking this deposition as counsel for SP Fort Lauderdale Lender, LLC only. Okay?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever given a deposition before?
A. No.
Q. Have you taken depositions?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've attended depositions?
A. Yes.
Q. Let me just go over a couple of things so that the record is clear. During the course of the deposition I will try to ask questions that are clear and unambiguous. But if for any reason you don't
understand a question that I ask, I'm going to ask you to tell me you don't understand and ask me to rephrase or let me know what the problem is. Okay?
A. Yes.
Q. If you answer a question, then I and the record are going to understand that you applied normal English meaning and you understood the question. Okay?
A. Is that a question?
Q. Yes, it is. When I put okay and a question inflection, that's a question.
A. Yes.
Q. During the course of the deposition -- you've been pretty good at it so far -- I'm going to ask you to give a verbal and word answers, yes or no, not an uh-huh or aha. And will you do that for me?
A. Yes.
Q. And during the course of the deposition I will try not to talk over you. I would ask you and all counsel not to talk over each other. The court reporter will appreciate it and we will have a better record. Okay?
A. Yes.
Q. I will tell you for the purpose of this
deposition if I use the word "okay" or "correct" or "is that right" at the end of a statement, that's a

```
question. Okay?
A. Yes.
Q. You understand today you are under oath, same as if we were in court?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there any reason, health, medication, anything that you feel would make it impossible for you to give a full and complete deposition?
A. No.
MR. GILLMAN: Let's have marked as Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 and I'll hand it over to you. And I may or may not during the course of the deposition have enough copies for everybody but hopefully I will.
(Exhibits 1 and 2 marked for identification)
Q. Exhibit 1 is a document entitled Notice of
Taking Rule 1.310(B)(6) Deposition of Corporate
Representative of Corus Construction Venture, LLC, and Exhibit 2 is the Renotice of Taking Rule 1.310(B)(6) Deposition of Corporate Representative of Corus Construction Venture, LLC. Have you seen these documents before today?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's focus if we will on Exhibit 2. Before we do that why don't we get a little bit of background.
```


## You are an attorney, is that right?

A. Correct.
Q. And if you could just give us, briefly, your educational background?
A. I went to college, graduated from The Ohio State University, 1977, and graduated from Case Western Reserve Law School in Cleveland, Ohio in 1980.
Q. Briefly your work history starting in 1980.
A. I worked -- I took a job in Chicago working
for a management labor law firm, and then in 1982 I
started my own law firm. In 1997 I was offered the
position at Corus Bank to be essentially general
counsel --
Q. Is that ' 87 or ' 97 ?
A. '97-- general counsel of the bank, not the bank shares and managed the legal matters.

Approximately October of 2009 I became
employed by Northwest Management, LLC.
Q. In what capacity?
A. As general counsel of ST Residential and general counsel of Northwest Investments.
Q. ST Residential, is that its formal legal name?
A. ST Residential, LLC.
Q. And Northwest Management, LLC, are both of those companies sitused in Illinois or elsewhere?
A. Well, they are Delaware corporations, Delaware LLCs.
Q. Where is their principal place of business?
A. I would say Chicago.
Q. Just briefly, during the time that you were with the management and labor law firm did you practice management and labor law?
A. Yes.
Q. During the time that you had your own law firm did you specialize in any particular area of the law?
A. It was an evolving process. I --
Q. What areas of law did your firm or you specialize in during that 1982 to 1997 time period?
A. In the early ' 80 s I handled approximately 50 Social Security disability appeals. I had a number of administrative hearings. I gradually began moving -obtaining clients, banks as clients, started doing general matters for banks of every nature. A number of my clients were eventually purchased by one bank, and the practice evolved more towards from commercial litigation towards transactional work as the years went by.
Q. So your practice area initially was more litigation oriented either in the courts or appeals, correct?
A. Initially.
Q. In the courts or administrative, right?
A. Right.
Q. And then did it evolve in your practice to transactional work or did it stay litigation when you were doing work for the banks?
A. It evolved to transactional work.
Q. And the bank that was acquiring your bank clients, was that Corus?
A. It became known as Corus. It was previously known as River Forest State Bank.
Q. Would it be fair to say that your specialization or your expertise is in the area of banking litigation and transactional work?
A. Yes.
Q. Would the transactional work include commercial loans?
A. Yes.
Q. Has any bank or bank client of which you were associated other than Corus ever been declared insolvent and had the FDIC or some other governmental entity appointed as its receiver or conservator?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Have you ever had either in a litigation, transactional or any litigation -- any aspect of your
work prior to Corus' insolvency had any involvement with the FDIC?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Did any of the banks that you worked for or did work for as a client or as general counsel ever acquire any assets or liabilities from the FDIC in its capacity as receiver of any bank?
A. Not to my knowledge. Not to my recollection.
Q. And you have never worked for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or any related governmental entity, correct?
A. I may have briefly been on the payroll of the FDIC as receiver after 9/11/2009.
Q. We'll spend a little bit more time on that in a moment. Right now I was just looking for background. So prior to the insolvency determination and the appointment of the FDIC as receiver of Corus Bank on September 11, 2009 you had never had any experience either as a client's attorney or as a bank's attorney with the FDIC, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. I would like you to go to Exhibit 2. Exhibit 2 , which is the renotice, have you seen it before today?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you reviewed it?
A. Yes.
Q. And you, I understand, have been designated by, and I'm going to use the term CCV, but the plaintiff, Corus Construction Venture, LLC, you've been designated as the sole designee on each of the 16 topics, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Who designated you?
A. As general counsel I conferred with outside counsel.
Q. So you designated yourself --

MR. TRENCH: Wait. Let him finish. He might not be done with the answer.
Q. Had you finished?
A. No.
Q. If not, go ahead.
A. As general counsel I conferred with outside counsel and we discussed the appropriate representative. I recommended to the asset manager that I be the corporate representative, and that's the end of my answer.
Q. The asset manager, who is that person?
A. Jim Dow.
Q. Spell it please, the second name.
A. D-O-W.
Q. And Mr. Dow is employed by whom?
A. Northwest Management.
Q. Is asset manager his formal title at Northwest

Management, speaking of Mr. Dow?
A. I don't know if he has a formal title at

## Northwest Management.

Q. Does he have employ anywhere other than Northwest Management?
A. He is an officer of ST Residential.
Q. What is his office?
A. Senior vice president.
Q. Does he have a designation "senior vice president" of something?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Does he have any employ or position of any
kind with any other entity other than Northwest
Management and ST Residential, speaking of Mr. Dow?
A. Professional?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Do you have any professional position or relation to any entity other than Northwest Management, LLC and general counsel of ST Residential?
A. No.
Q. So you are not an employee of CCV, the plaintiff in this case?
A. No.
Q. Does the plaintiff in this case, CCV, have any employees?
A. No.
Q. Does it have any officers?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Northwest Management, what is its relationship to CCV?
A. It's an affiliate.
Q. And an affiliate in what way?
A. It's --
Q. Let me ask this. Northwest Management is owned by whom?
A. Northwest Investments.
Q. And Northwest Investments is owned by whom?
A. A group of different investment companies.
Q. And is Northwest Investments an LLC?
A. Yes.
Q. Who's the managing member or members?
A. Of Northwest Investments?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. I can tell you in general the entities that comprise Northwest Investments.
Q. Hang on.

MR. GILLMAN: Let me have this marked as
Exhibit 3.
(Exhibit 3 marked for identification).
Q. Let me give you what has been marked as Exhibit 3. It is a document that bears the Bates number of CCV PROD000238.

MR. GILLMAN: From this point on if it is acceptable to you, David, when I designate Bates numbers I'll just use CCV and the numbers without the zeros and without the PROD. Is that okay?

MR. TRENCH: That's fine with me.
Q. Take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit
3. Do you recognize this?
A. Yes.
Q. This has been represented to be the Corus Construction Venture, LLC organization chart. Is it accurate to date to the best of your knowledge?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go down on this. There's a box that's not shaded that has a blank LLC, "the new property owner (wholly owned by Corus Construction Venture, LLC). Has such an entity been created?
A. That is an example of the single purpose entities which are formed to own assets that have
become owned by CCV. So there's a number of entities typically designated as something like 8255 Las Vegas Marketing LLC, would be an example.
Q. With regard to the property that's at issue here, the SB Hotel loan property, has there been a single purpose subsidiary of Corus Construction Venture created as to that property, that loan?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. So then we have CCV and we have a 60 percent member interest FDIC as receiver. Is that still correct?
A. Yes.
Q. When CCV was originally created the FDIC as receiver was the one hundred percent member, is that right?
A. I believe so.
Q. And when created, the FDIC as receiver was the sole managing member of Corus Construction Venture, is that right?
A. I don't know if that's true or not.
Q. We'll get some documents later. Were you associated -- let me ask this. Did you have any association with Corus Construction Venture during the time that the FDIC, and I'll use the term FDIC-R to designate it in its receivership capacity, was the one
hundred percent member of that entity?
A. No.
Q. So you were not involved in the creation of CCV , is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. You did not draft, negotiate, review or have any dealings with the documentation that created CCV, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you did not have anything to do with the initial operating agreement of CCV, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Who's the person that would have knowledge as to the creation of CCV?
A. Whoever worked on the transaction from the --
Q. Do you know who that person is?
A. I think there's a number of people.
Q. Well, one of the designated topics, specifically designated topic 6 is the facts, circumstances and reasons for the formation of CCV. You are the person designated for that, right?
A. Yes.
Q. What, if anything, did you do to prepare yourself to give testimony on the facts, circumstances and reasons for the formation of CCV?
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A. Well, I think I know the facts, circumstances and reasons for the formation of CCV. I thought about it. I reviewed some notes on -- relating to the formation documents, and that was largely the extent of my preparation for that question.
Q. Did you confer with anyone that is currently or formerly with FDIC-R with regard to the formation of CCV?
A. No.
Q. One of the issues or one of the designated topics is the terms of the loan contribution and sales agreement between the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as receiver for Corus Bank, NA and CCV. It's topic 8. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. You are the designated person on that?
A. Yes.
Q. What, if anything, do you know about that topic other than reading it? And by reading it, I'm talking about the loan contribution and sales agreement.
A. I have the knowledge gained from working as an officer of ST Residential and routinely being involved in issues relating to the loan contribution and sale agreement for a period of approximately two years.
Q. So your knowledge is working with the document post-creation, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Sometimes I may use the term LCSA. If I do
that's the Loan Contribution and Sales Agreement between the FDIC-R and Corus Bank. Is that okay?
A. Yes.
Q. In your day-to-day do you refer to it as the LCSA?
A. I use that term.
Q. Who was the drafter of the LCSA?
A. I don't know.
Q. Who negotiated the document, if anyone?
A. I don't know.
Q. Who represented CCV in that negotiation?
A. CCV?
Q. Yes.
A. Well, are you talking about the --
Q. The LCSA.
A. The attorneys for the FDIC.
Q. Do you have knowledge as to who it was that represented CCV in the drafting, negotiation and agreement of the LCSA?
A. Whoever represented the FDIC, since the FDIC owned a hundred percent of CCV at the time of the LCSA.
Q. Mr. Solomon, your answer is self-evident to me as well. But I think it appears that what your answer is based on is the fact that the FDIC as receiver created and was the one hundred percent member of CCV at the time the LCSA was negotiated and entered into, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So the FDIC-R was negotiating with itself as CCV being the hundred percent member, right?
A. Yes.
Q. The LCSA, as the designated representative of CCV here today, is it clear and unambiguous in its terms?
A. Which terms are you referring to?
Q. Any terms. Is the totality of that document, the words used, the grammar, the context, is that document clear and unambiguous, speaking of the LCSA?
A. I'd be hard-pressed to globally endorse any document as being perfectly unambiguous in totality.
Q. Let me try it a different way. Are there any provisions that you as the designated representative of CCV, are there any provisions of the LCSA that CCV contends are ambiguous as they relate to issues in this case?
A. I don't contend that any of the provisions are
ambiguous.
Q. Again, you used the "I don't" and that's fine.

But you understand that when you say I, you mean CCV, because you are the designated representative, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you understand that the testimony that you give here today binds CCV in this litigation, correct?
A. It seems like that's a legal conclusion but it seems like a correct conclusion.
Q. You are also familiar with the Intercreditor Agreement between Corus Bank and SP Lender? That's the term I use for SP Fort Lauderdale, my client.
A. I have looked at it.
Q. Did you have any involvement in the drafting, negotiation or approval of the Intercreditor Agreement?
A. I don't recall.

MR. GILLMAN: Let's go ahead and mark as
Exhibit 4, the Intercreditor Agreement.
(Exhibit 4 marked for identification).
MR. GILLMAN: Then we can mark as Exhibit 5 the LCSA.
(Exhibit 5 marked for identification)
MR. GILLMAN: I'm going to go ahead and mark
as Exhibit 6 the complaint and some other
documents.

MR. ALTSCHUL: Which one?
MR. GILLMAN: I'm going to mark as Exhibit 6 the lawsuit filed by Corus Construction. Exhibit 7
will be the answer.
(Exhibits 6 and 7 marked for identification)
MR. GILLMAN: Exhibit 8 is plaintiff's Answer and Affirmative Defenses.
(Exhibit 8 marked for identification)
MR. GILLMAN: And Exhibit 9 is the reply.
(Exhibit 9 marked for identification)
BY MR. GILLMAN:
Q. Let's try this. Exhibit 4, do you recognize that as the Subordination and Intercreditor Agreement by and between Corus Bank and SP Fort Lauderdale?
A. Yes, it appears to be.
Q. This is a document that is dated as of

December 15, 2006, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You were at that time general counsel of Corus

## Bank?

A. Yes.
Q. Did you personally participate in December of 2006 or earlier in the drafting, negotiation, execution, review of the Subordination and Intercreditor Agreement, Exhibit 4?
A. I don't recall its. It's possible that I was involved but there were a lot of loans that were being produced at that time, loans that number into the billions of dollars per year.
Q. The Corus loan that's referenced -- I'm just going to refer to this generically as the Subordination Agreement, is that okay?
A. Yes.
Q. The loan referenced in the Subordination Agreement on behalf of Corus was a $\$ 137$ million loan, is that right?
A. Recital A indicates a $\$ 139$ million loan.
Q. In 2006 was this deemed to be a small loan for Corus, medium, a large?
A. No, this would be a large loan at any time.
Q. Would it be one of the larger commercial construction loans on behalf of Corus?
A. Yes.
Q. Who was the team for Corus on this loan?
A. The -- Keith Gibbons was primary loan officer.

I really don't recall who assisted him at that time.
I'm not sure which attorney on the legal staff, whether it was myself or one of the other attorneys who worked at the bank.
Q. How large was your legal staff in 2006? And
A. I do not.
Q. The Subordination Agreement, is it clear and unambiguous?
A. Are you referring to Section 3?
Q. I'm referring to the document as a whole.
A. Subordination language appears to be well drafted. Typically I think things are well drafted when they are clear and unambiguous.
Q. You made reference to the subordination language. I'm referring to the totality of the Subordination Agreement. Let me refer to it slightly different.

Is there any part of the subordination agreement that CCV believes to be relevant or material to this action that it contends is unclear or ambiguous?
A. No prior to this document, which I note is 35 pages, approximately, long, has been brought to my attention as being problematic in its clarity.
Q. Well, I'm asking it a little bit different. Does CCV contend that any material part of the Subordination Agreement is unclear or ambiguous?
A. When you say contend do you mean in our pleadings?
Q. I mean in this litigation, in your pleadings,

I'm talking now about in house.
A. It was probably three attorneys.
Q. Including you or in addition to you?
A. Including me. There might have been four.

I'm not sure when different people --
Q. So there was you and who else?
A. Pete Freund, Kari Sheinfeld, S-H-E-I-N-F-E-L-D
and that's all I recall at this time with regard to
December of '06.
Q. There is a reference on the first page to DLA

Piper. Were they Corus Bank's lawyer?
A. Yes.
Q. Did Corus Bank draft this subordination agreement?
A. Well, it caused its attorneys to draft it.
Q. As agents for Corus Bank, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So the drafters were Corus Bank through its attorney agents, is that right?
A. Yes, although it should be noted that any document like this receives significant review by the counter party.
Q. But as to what review was done, you have no recollection? When I say review I'm talking review by the counter party?
use is Intercreditor Agreement from this point on, okay, and it is referring to Exhibit 4?
A. Yes.
Q. The Intercreditor Agreement was entered on December 15, 2006, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is the same day that Corus Bank's loan to SB Hotel was made, is that right?
A. I believe so.
Q. Why don't you take a look at Exhibit 6, which is the Complaint and look at Exhibit A. Exhibit A to the -- let me go back a little bit.

Exhibit 6 is the Complaint that was filed by Corus Construction Venture against SB Hotel, SP Fort Lauderdale and a number of other defendants, is that right?
A. I agree that the date of the construction loan agreement is the same. The loan appears to have been made on the same day.
Q. Let's do the second question. Do you recognize Exhibit 6 as the complaint filed by CCV in this case to foreclose on its mortgage and for other relief?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you see the complaint before it was

## filed?

A. Yes.
Q. Did you review it for factual accuracy?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Did anyone else other than your counsel review the complaint for factual accuracy before it was filed?
A. We -- someone provided the material amounts due from our system, and I generally reviewed the complaint.
Q. Did anyone else review the complaint?
A. Not to my recollection.
Q. Who authorized its filing?
A. I did.
Q. Was the FDIC-R consulted?
A. About this particular --
Q. Yes, sir.
A. They may have been generally informed.
Q. Were they provided a copy before its filing?
A. No.
Q. At the time of this filing, March 11, 2010, that's the date of the stamp on the first page, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Who was the manager of CCV?
A. ST Residential, LLC.
Q. Was ST Residential, LLC the holder of 40 percent interest in CCV on that date?
A. Yes.
Q. We can go back, we are going to get into this in a minute but let's go back to Exhibit 3 so we can run through and complete that. We had been talking about CCV and then going up we had FDIC as receiver, 60 percent member, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And when CCV was formed the FDIC as receiver was the hundred percent member, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Subsequently there was a sale and transfer of 40 percent of the FDIC's membership interest, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And was that to a different entity than ST

## Residential?

A. No, ST Residential was known at the time of the transfer as CCV Managing Member, LLC and subsequently amended its name.
Q. So ST Residential, LLC then known by a different name acquired the 40 percent interest and subsequently changed its name to ST Residential, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. At the time that it acquired its interest, and I'll refer to ST Residential as it and its former name, okay?
A. Yes.
Q. It also became and acquired its interest as the managing member, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the FDIC retained a 60 percent interest, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So the FDIC will share in any revenues or profits that ST Residential -- strike that, that CCV obtains with regard to any of the assets?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that a 60 percent profit interest?
A. Generally.
Q. Is that a net profit interest?
A. Depending on how you define net.
Q. How would you define net? Better yet, what is the interest that it would receive?
A. Well, you're grossly simplifying a very complex structured transaction. Therefore I hesitate to give simple conclusory answers about approximately more than six complicated agreements. But generally the FDIC is a 60 percent owner and will generally
receive 60 percent of net income.
There's multiple loan facilities that are part of the transaction. There's issues as to proper allocation of expenses between the parties.
Q. Have there been any distributions to date to the FDIC receiver from CCV?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Now, the 60 percent member currently is FDIC receiver, is that right?
A. I'm not positive that it's FDIC as receiver or FDIC in its other capacity.
Q. Its other capacity is in its corporate capacity, is that right?
A. Corporate capacity.
Q. Is the FDIC in its corporate capacity a guarantor of any of the former Corus loans that were transferred to CCV?
A. A guarantor -- there are provisions under certain circumstances where a repurchase of a loan may be provided for.
Q. You referenced 60 percent of net income. Would that also include sales proceeds?
A. Sales proceeds are the typical form of income.
Q. Well, to the extent that the property is operating, there would be operational income, correct?
Q. Would you spell the last name?
A. H-U-N-D-L-E-Y.
Q. Does Mr. Hundley have positions with any entity other than ST Residential, business positions?
A. Not to my knowledge. He may be an officer of Northwest Investments.
Q. You don't know?
A. I don't know as I sit here today exactly what his officer designations are.
Q. ST Residential, according to Exhibit 3, is a one hundred percent subsidiary of or is a hundred percent owned by Northwest Investments, LLC as the sole member, is that accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that what it was at acquisition of the 40 percent interest in CCV and correct through till today?
A. Yes.
Q. Going up from Northwest Investments, LLC it lists its membership, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And its membership are listed generically, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. In Exhibit 3?
A. If the -- yes, there would be income if there's rental property.
Q. The property that's at issue here, the SB

Hotel condominium, if the CCV is successful in its foreclosure does it intend to operate or immediately sell the property?
A. Operate.
Q. Operate as a hotel?
A. I don't think a final decision has been made.
Q. Who will make that decision?
A. The CEO with advice and consent from the board of directors.
Q. And that would be the CEO of CCV or some other entity?
A. ST Residential.
Q. And the board of directors, would that be of CCV or some other entity?
A. The board of directors of ST Residential sole member Northwest Investments.
Q. Because LLCs don't have boards of directors, right, they have managers or boards of managers, right?
A. I think they can have boards of directors.
Q. So we were talking, the CEO of ST Residential, who is that?
A. Wade Hundley. not sure of this but I think there may be an owner of Northwest Investments that is then owned by the five affiliates that are described in the top tier.
Q. Do you know that to be the case?
A. I think it's the case.
Q. Is there a reason that this diagram doesn't reflect the true state of ownership?
A. The reason is someone didn't put it on the diagram, but it's a pass-through entity.
Q. What's the name of that entity?
A. It is something like CB VII.
Q. CB7? VII?
A. Right.
Q. LLC?
A. Yes.
Q. And CB VII, LLC would be the one hundred percent member owner of Northwest Investments, LLC?
A. Correct.
Q. And then the entities generically listed on

Exhibit 3 above Northwest would be the member owners of CB VII, LLC and the percentages reflected?
A. Correct.
Q. So the way that this lists on Exhibit 3, I
want you to help me a little bit. The managing member

|  | 38 |  | 40 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | is an affiliate of Starwood Capital, is that right? | 1 | A. Not to my knowledge. |
| 2 | A. Yes. | 2 | Q. Who is the owner of Starwood Capital, or CEO |
| 3 | Q. What's the name? | 3 | or anybody? |
| 4 | A. I don't recall the name. | 4 | A. The CEO whose name is commonly associated with |
| 5 | Q. What is Starwood Capital? | 5 | Starwood Capital is Barry Sternlicht. |
| 6 | A. Starwood Capital is the typical name used for | 6 | Q. I want to go back to the acquisition of the 40 |
| 7 | an amalgamation of Starwood Capital Enterprises. | 7 | percent interest in Corus Construction. That was done |
| 8 | Q. Well, is Starwood Capital the hundred | 8 | by the entity then called CCV Managing Member now known |
| 9 | percent -- let me ask you first, are all of these | 9 | as ST Residential, correct? |
| 10 | owners, are they LLCs or some other form? | 10 | A. Yes. |
| 11 | A. I don't know if they are all LLCs. There | 11 | Q. At the time of that acquisition did it have |
| 12 | could be an LLP in there. I don't know. | 12 | any officers or directors, or was it at that time a |
| 13 | Q. Would Starwood Capital be the hundred percent | 13 | paper entity only? |
| 14 | partner, shareholder or member of this affiliate of | 14 | A. It probably had officers. |
| 15 | Starwood Capital that's the 39.61 percent member owner | 15 | Q. But you don't know? |
| 16 | and manager of Northwest Investments? | 16 | A. I believe they had officers. I don't know who |
| 17 | A. I don't know if -- I can't say with absolute | 17 | those officers were at that moment. |
| 18 | certainty that the ultimate owner is Starwood Capital | 18 | Q. Who did the due diligence on the acquisition |
| 19 | per se. | 19 | of the 40 percent interest? |
| 20 | Q. All right. It could be an intermediary entity | 20 | A. There was a team of people from the different |
| 21 | or entities? | 21 | entities that spread out across the country. |
| 22 | A. I believe as the exhibit indicates, I believe | 22 | Q. When you say a team of people from the |
| 23 | that the ownership is all Starwood Capital affiliate | 23 | different entities are you talking about a team of |
| 24 | entities. | 24 | people from the ultimate ownership entities? |
| 25 | Q. And TPG is who? | 25 | A. Yes. |
|  | 39 |  | 1 |
| 1 | A. Rather large private equity company. | 1 | Q. So from Starwood Capital, TPG, Perry, Wilbur |
| 2 | Q. And Perry Capital? | 2 | Ross and LeFrak, teams from those organizations did the |
| 3 | A. Private equity company. | 3 | due diligence, is that right? |
| 4 | Q. And WLR LeFrak, L-E-F-R-A-K? | 4 | A. Yes. They generally looked at assets and |
| 5 | A. That's an affiliate of -- it's Wilbur L. Ross | 5 | divided up some of the work. |
| 6 | and Richard LeFrak are the principal parties. | 6 | Q. And the due diligence that was done with |
| 7 | Q. And they are hedge funds, is that right, or | 7 | regard to the SB Hotel loan and the entirety of that |
| 8 | private equity funds? | 8 | issue, who did that? |
| 9 | A. Their private equity. | 9 | A. Based on recently acquired information it's my |
| 10 | Q. And the box "management," what is that? | 10 | understanding that Starwood Capital was the affiliate |
| 11 | A. I believe that's an ownership interest of | 11 | reviewing this loan. |
| 12 | management. | 12 | Q. And Starwood Capital owns the affiliate that |
| 13 | Q. What do you mean by that? | 13 | is the managing member of Northwest Investments, |
| 14 | A. Management of ST Residential. | 14 | correct? |
| 15 | Q. And management of ST Residential, does that | 15 | A. Correct. |
| 16 | include you? | 16 | Q. And Northwest Investments owns and manages ST |
| 17 | A. No. | 17 | Residential, correct, it's the managing member? |
| 18 | Q. Who is included in that management? | 18 | MR. TRENCH: Sole member it says. |
| 19 | A. Wade Hundley, who I believe is the only | 19 | Q. Let me ask you, is ST Residential member |
| 20 | person. | 20 | managed or other managed? |
| 21 | Q. Wade Hundley, does he have any association or | 21 | A. It's managed by its sole member. |
| 22 | affiliation with Starwood Capital? | 22 | Q. So Northwest Investments is the manager of ST |
| 23 | A. He's the CEO of ST Residential. | 23 | Residential, correct? |
| 24 | Q. Not my question. Does he have any association | 24 | A. Yes. |
|  | or affiliation with Starwood Capital? | 25 | Q. And ST Residential is the managing member of |

CCV, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Taking it the other way, Corus Construction
CCV is managed by ST Residential, right?
A. Yes.
Q. ST Residential is managed by Northwest
Investments, LLC?
A. Yes.
Q. And Northwest Investments, LLC is managed by
the affiliate of Starwood Capital?
A. Well, there's a board of directors for
Northwest Investments.
Q. I'm just looking at the chart, the wire
diagram that was provided by CCV, and the affiliate of
Starwood Capital generically listed here is the 39.61
percent member owner of Northwest Investments and it is
the managing member, correct?
A. I don't know if that's correct. The board of
directors of Northwest Investments generally manages ST
Residential. Starwood Capital takes an active role. I
don't know if managing member is absolutely correct as
a matter of law.
Q. Well, you are the only person that I have here
today and the only document with regard to the
corporate structure of CCV that was provided to me
other than obviously operating agreements and things like that is the Exhibit 3, which is CCV 238.

Will you agree that it reflects that the affiliate of Starwood Capital is the managing member of Northwest Investments, LLC?
A. Yes.

MR. GILLMAN: David, if this is inaccurate can we get an accurate document?

MR. TRENCH: I'm not sure if it is inaccurate.
I think that your question went to who makes the
decisions about how Northwest, what Northwest
Investments did and he indicates a board of
directors, which wouldn't necessarily show in this
type of chart.
MR. GILLMAN: That actually wasn't my question.

MR. TRENCH: That's the way I understood it.
MR. GILLMAN: No.
Q. My question was Northwest Investments, LLC,
and actually you are probably right because there's a
CB VII, LLC in between Northwest Investments, LLC and that is the hundred percent member of Northwest Investments, correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. So the affiliate of Starwood Capital is
actually the managing member of CB VII, LLC, is that right?
A. I don't know.
Q. Does CB stand for Corus Bank?
A. I don't know.
Q. The affiliate of Starwood Capital, it's owned by Starwood Capital and Starwood Capital did the due diligence on this loan and this property that's involved in the instant case, right?
A. That appears to be the case.
Q. What due diligence was done?
A. The property was looked at. It looks like a law firm prepared a -- did a review of mechanic's liens. There's an Excel spreadsheet that I believe was sent to you yesterday that reflects the work of the firm of Pircher Nichols.

MR. TRENCH: Joe, do you need a break?
MR. GILLMAN: The one thing I didn't tell you is if you need a break, there's no question currently pending. We have been going for a little bit, if you want to take a break now is a good time.

THE WITNESS: Take five minutes.
(Recess taken in the proceedings)
BY MR. GILLMAN:
Q. During the break did you have any substantive discussion with regard to your deposition with anyone?
A. No.
Q. Shortly before your deposition we were talking about due diligence and we'll have marked in a little bit but you understand there was a document request that was served by my client, SP Lender, on CCV requesting due diligence materials, all documents relating to the due diligence performed with regard to the acquisition, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Prior to yesterday what, if anything, had you done or had CCV done to acquire the documentation with regard to that due diligence?
A. I had extensive and multiple conversations with my outside legal counsel regarding how best to comply with the document production request. I caused a search of various databases to occur using a series of search terms, and also had my paralegal order the credit file from Trimont, which is a sub servicer of Corus Construction Venture, which was I believe produced.
Q. Anything else?
A. A few days ago, after you had filed motion to compel and after consultation again with legal counsel,

I sent an e-mail to various persons who I thought might have knowledge of due diligence that was conducted prior to ST Residential becoming the managing member asking them if they had, on a voluntary basis could advise me if they knew of any type of due diligence materials which were produced in the process of underwriting the purchase of the Northwest Investment interest.
Q. You've completed your answer?
A. Yes.
Q. You indicated that you had done a search of databases. What databases did you search? And I'm talking about prior to two or three days ago.
A. The CCV computer records and a hard drive that the FDIC transferred to ST which related to the loans that were part -- that comprised the assets which were the subject of the LCSA.
Q. Anything else?
A. I mentioned the loan files, the actual loan files from Trimont were produced. I didn't produce the draw records. That would typically be many, many banker boxes of construction draw requests with backup. I didn't think it was relevant to the questions that were requested.
Q. Actually your answer is a little bit broader
than my question. I want to confine myself to a search for due diligence materials. And when I talk about due diligence material I'm talking about materials that were reviewed by the entity acquiring the 40 percent interest in CCV or its members and managers.

And I understand -- let me ask you this. The transfer of the loan files, hard drive from the FDIC, was that transferred to all prospective bidders?
A. No. That occurred after the purchase.
Q. The CCV computer, was that transferred to or access made available to prospective bidders?
A. No, that was created after the purchase.
Q. And the loan files from Trimont, was that something that was available to and reviewed by prospective bidders?
A. No, those were -- files were transferred to Trimont.
Q. Let me back up and let's see if we can get a chronology working. Is it correct that a determination of receivership and appointment of the FDIC as receiver with regard to Corus Bank occurred on September 11, 2009?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it accurate that a little under a month later CCV was formed on October 9, 2009?
4
5
3
4
A. I don't know. That sounds likely, that it was formed days before the transaction occurred.
Q. Let me give you some documents and we'll get it into the record. We are going to be talking about exhibits a little out of order and we will fill them in a minute.
(Exhibit 13 marked for identification)
Q. Let me show you what has been marked as

Exhibit 13. Do you recognize Exhibit 13 as the document determining the insolvency and appointing the FDIC as receiver of Corus Bank?
A. Yes.
(Exhibit 14 marked for identification)
Q. Now I'm having marked as Exhibit 14, Exhibit 14 is a document entitled Certificate of Formation of Corus Construction Venture. It's Bates number CCV
2494. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is Timothy Kruse?
A. He's an official with the FDIC.
Q. And this formation was at the time that the FDIC-R was the sole member, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the date, the execution date is October 9, is that right, October 9, 2009?
A. Yes.
Q. And the date filed with the Secretary of State in Delaware was October 12, 2009, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And there was an operating agreement, is that right?
A. I believe there was.
Q. Let me give it to you.
(Exhibit 15 marked for identification)
Q. Showing you Exhibit 15. Do you recognize Exhibit 15 which is titled Limited Liability Company Operating Agreement Corus Construction Venture, LLC, CCV 5644 through 5656 as the operating agreement for CCV at its formation?
A. I don't think I've ever looked at this before but I recognize it as an operating agreement for CCV.
Q. I'd like you to turn if you will to the page
that is CCV 5647. This operating agreement has an effective date of October 13, 2009, correct?
A. October what?
Q. October 13, 2009.
A. Yes.
Q. The FDIC-R was the sole member, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was vested with the exclusive

|  | 50 |  | 52 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | management, the FDIC-R, correct? | 1 | A. I don't know. |
| 2 | A. Yes. | 2 | Q. Who would know? |
| 3 | Q. So we have Corus' -- Corus is determined to be | 3 | A. The FDIC-R. |
| 4 | insolvent September 11, 2009, the FDIC is appointed | 4 | Q. Is it accurate that between approximately |
| 5 | receiver that same day, correct? | 5 | September 11 and October 16 there was a bid process in |
| 6 | A. Yes. | 6 | which prospective purchasers reviewed whatever they |
| 7 | Q. There was no immediate transfer of any assets | 7 | were going to review and made a decision and made a bid |
| 8 | of Corus Bank on September 11, 2009, is that right? | 8 | to the FDIC-R? |
| 9 | A. No. | 9 | A. I don't know. I think the bid process may |
| - | Q. That's wrong? | 10 | have started before that. |
|  | A. Yes. | 11 | Q. So do you know whether it started before the |
| 12 | Q. Okay. What assets were transferred on | 12 | insolvency determination or not? |
| 13 | September 11, 2009? | 13 | A. My understanding is that it did. I can't cite |
| 14 | A. All of the assets. | 14 | any hard evidence of that fact. |
| 15 | Q. All of the assets -- excuse me. There was a | 15 | Q. Was that done by request for bids, proposals? |
| 16 | transfer of the assets to the FDIC-R, correct? | 16 | Do you know how that was done prior to the FDIC being |
| 17 | A. Yes. | 17 | appointed as receiver? |
| 18 | Q. There was no transfer of any assets of Corus | 18 | A. No. |
| 19 | Bank by FDIC-R on September 11, is that right? | 19 | Q. Do you know who issued the request for bids? |
| 20 | A. No, I think they may have transferred the | 20 | A. No. |
| 2 | branch -- the bank branches to MB Financial. | 21 | Q. You are familiar that there was a bid process |
| 22 | Q. So the branch bank assets and the deposit | 22 | that culminated with the transfer to CCV and the |
| 23 | liabilities were transferred? | 23 | acquisition of the 40 percent management interest by ST |
| 24 | A. I don't know the exact date but they could | 24 | Residential, right? |
| 25 | have been transferred as of the 11th. I know that when | 25 | A. Yes. |
|  | 51 |  | 53 |
| 1 | I left the building that night they were putting up an | 1 | Q. There were other bidders, correct? |
| 2 | MB Financial sign. | 2 | A. That is the indication on the FDIC Web site. |
| 3 | Q. But the loan assets, those were not | 3 | Q. I think you indicated that people or people |
| 4 | transferred on September 11, correct? | 4 | affiliated with the top rung of owner manager of ST |
| 5 | MR. TRENCH: Not transferred by the FDIC-R you | 5 | Residential were involved in the due diligence for the |
| 6 | mean? | 6 | bidder that ultimately prevailed, right? |
| 7 | Q. Not transferred by FDIC-R, correct? | 7 | A. Persons affiliated with the ultimate owners of |
| 8 | A. Not to my knowledge. | 8 | Northwest Investments were involved in the bid due |
| 9 | Q. So then a month later CCV is formed? | 9 | diligence. |
| 10 | A. Yes. | 10 | Q. Who put in that bid? In other words, was |
| 11 | Q. By the FDIC as its sole member and manage | 11 | there a single entity or group of entities that put in |
| 12 | right? | 12 | the bid on behalf of what ultimately became ST |
| 13 | A. Yes. | 13 | Residential? |
| 14 | Q. Then on October 16 you have the Loan | 14 | A. I don't know. |
| 15 | Contribution and Sale Agreement, the LCSA, is that | 15 | Q. Who would know that? |
| 16 | right? | 16 | A. There's probably several people associated |
| 17 | A. Yes. | 17 | with Starwood or TPG who would know. |
| 18 | Q. Were all of the loan assets transferred to CCV | 18 | Q. Can you identify their names? |
| 19 | by the FDIC-R, or were there some that were retained or | 19 | A. Marcos Alverados. |
| 20 | transferred to somebody else? | 20 | Q. Spell, is it Marcos? |
| 21 | A. I think there were small loans that were | 21 | A. Marcos. |
| 22 | transferred to MB Financial. | 22 | Q. Spell the last name please. |
| 23 | Q. Consumer loans? | 23 | A. A-L-V-A-R-A-D-O-S. Dan Yih. |
| 24 | A. Consumer. | 24 | Q. Dan? |
| 25 | Q. Did the FDIC-R retain any loans? | 25 | A. Yes. |


|  | 54 |  | 56 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q. Can you spell it the last name? | 1 | this bid were documents that he wanted and needed to |
| 2 | A. Y-I-H. | 2 | prosecute or defend this case, they would give them to |
| 3 | Q. Mike Muscolino. Spell Muscolino, please. | 3 | you, wouldn't they? |
| 4 | A. M-U-S-C-O-L-I-N-O. | 4 | A. I don't know. I could ask them. |
| 5 | Q. Anyone else? | 5 | Q. You seriously don't believe that they would |
| 6 | A. There were a number of other people that were | 6 | give you the documents if it was determined that you |
| 7 | involved but I don't know whether they have detailed | 7 | needed them to prosecute your case or defend the claims |
| 8 | knowledge of the bid process. | 8 | by SP? |
| 9 | Q. The three that you identified, who were they | 9 | MR. TRENCH: I object to the form of the |
| 10 | employed with in 2009? | 0 | question. |
| 11 | A. I don't know who they were employed by, but | 11 | Q. You can answer. |
| 12 | Marcos and Dan Yih are affiliated with Starwood | 12 | A. I didn't say that. I said I could ask them. |
| 13 | Capital. Mike Muscolino is affiliated with TPG. | 13 | Do you want me to speculate on what they would do? Is |
| 14 | Q. And the two Starwood gentlemen are officed | 4 | that the answer that you seek? |
| 15 | where? | 15 | Q. No, I don't want you to speculate but based on |
| 16 | A. Greenwich, Connecticut. | 16 | your experience --- |
| 17 | Q. And Mr. Muscolino? | 17 | A. You are asking me what I believe would happen. |
| 18 | A. Muscolino, I don't know where his office is. | 18 | That seems like speculation. |
| 19 | Q. You indicated that initially you did a | 19 | Q. I'll try more. Based on your experience and |
| 20 | database search, but the database search that you | 20 | based on the work that you have done, would you expect |
| 21 | searched by definition wouldn't have had any of the due | 21 | that they would give you whatever documents you needed |
| 22 | diligence documents, right? | 22 | to prosecute or defend the claims and counterclaims in |
| 23 | A. Correct. | 3 | this case? |
| 24 | Q. So you did no database search for due | 24 | A. Yes. |
| 25 | diligence documents up until, and you didn't do any | 25 | Q. Now, prior to a couple of days, you didn't ask |
|  | 55 |  | 57 |
| 1 | search at all up until a couple days ago, right? | 1 | anybody for any due diligence documents, correct? |
| 2 | A. For -- | 2 | A. More than a couple of days. A few days. |
| 3 | Q. Due diligence documents. | 3 | Q. When you asked a couple of days ago did you |
| 4 | A. No. | 4 | ask the people that you have identified, the three |
| 5 | Q. Why not? | 5 | people or anybody else? |
| 6 | A. We didn't have it. | 6 | A. I asked them and some others. |
| 7 | Q. Well, you understand that a document request | 7 | Q. Who else? |
| 8 | requires the party to produce that which is in their | 8 | A. Camille Douglas. |
| 9 | possession, custody or control, right? | 9 | Q. And who is she? |
| 10 | A. That's my understanding. | 10 | A. She is in the LeFrak organization. |
| 11 | Q. CCV through ST Residential, its manager, has | 11 | Q. Anybody else? |
| 12 | the ability to get the documents that it wants from its | 12 | A. Sol Safeieh, S-A-F-D-I-E-H, who is in the |
| 13 | upstream managers, isn't that right? | 13 | Richard Perry Capital company. I think I asked Richard |
| 14 | A. No. | 14 | LeFrak. |
| 15 | Q. No? If your counsel determined that those | 15 | Q. Anybody else? |
| 16 | upstream documents would be helpful to his case that he | 16 | A. I think that's it. |
| 17 | needed them for his case, they would give them to you, | 17 | Q. From the LeFrak organization and Richard Perry |
| 18 | isn't that right? | 18 | and your discussions with the Starwood and TPG people, |
| 19 | A. I could ask them for them. | 19 | is that how you learned that Starwood had conducted the |
| 20 | Q. You can do more than ask. You have a $\$ 139$ | 20 | due diligence with regard to the Fort Lauderdale hotel |
| 21 | million plus foreclosure action that's pending, right? |  | that's at issue here? |
| 22 | A. Yes. | 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | Q. If your counsel told you, hypothetically, that | 23 | Q. So I've put in front of you somewhere as |
| 24 | documents that Starwood had or the Starwood entity had, | 24 | Exhibit 10 the letter that Mr. Trench sent me |
|  | whoever it is that did the due diligence that led to |  | yesterday. |


|  |  |
| ---: | :---: |
| 1 | (Exhibit 10 marked for identification) |
| 2 | MR. TRENCH: You gave him a highlighted copy. |
| 3 | Did you intend to do that? |
| 4 | MR. GILLMAN: No. |
| 5 | Q. Showing you has been marked as Exhibit 10, it |
| 6 | does not -- the first is a cover letter dated November |
| 7 | 2, from Mr. Trench to myself, is that right? |
| 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | Q. And then the balance are Bates numbered CCV |
| 10 | 16536 through 16558, is that right? |
| 11 | A. Yes. |
| 12 | Q. From whom did you get those documents? |
| 13 | A. Marcos Alvarado. |
| 14 | Q. At Starwood or Starwood affiliate? |
| 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | Q. His e-mail is what? |
| 17 | MR. TRENCH: His e-mail address you mean? |
| 18 | MR. GILLMAN: Yes. |
| 19 | A. I don't know. M. Alvarado. I'm not sure what |
| 20 | the place is. I think it is Starwood. I think it's at |
| 21 | Starwood.com. |
| 22 | Q. And Mr. Alvarado sent you these pages, |
| 23 | correct? |
| 24 | A. Yes. |
| 25 | Q. The letter that Mr. Trench sent said that |

these may or may not be all due diligence documents. Do you know if there are other documents, due diligence documents at Starwood that have not been provided?
A. My understanding is that these are the extent of the documents that they have.
Q. And you have that understanding from who?
A. From Marcos, and counsel for LeFrak advised me that they didn't have anything. Someone from Perry advised me that the only thing they had were these documents, and someone from TPG has advised me that they're 99 percent sure that they don't have anything different than these documents.
Q. Anything else?
A. No.
Q. If you would turn to the second page. The second page 16536 through 16540, that was a Corus Bank document, correct?
A. I don't know that.
Q. What is Project Northwest?
A. That was the name given by the consortium that was investigating this.
Q. Let's go through this. By the way, have you read this document?
A. Yes.
Q. This is a document by its terms that predates
the insolvency of Corus, right?
A. I believe it does.
Q. This is a review and/or plan by Corus as to what to do if it foreclosed and received back the property, correct?
A. I don't know for certain that Corus produced it, but the FDIC was directing a lot of the actions at Corus prior to the receivership and therefore may have in an effort to conduct their bid process have utilized certain bank-generated information to have available for prospective bidders.
Q. You indicated that the FDIC was directing the actions of Corus Bank prior to September 11, 2009, is that right?
A. Regulators. Either the FDIC or the OCC. There was a consent order that had been entered.
Q. When was the consent order entered?
A. I think the consent order was entered in March of '09. The consent order required certain steps be taken.
Q. Did Corus Bank provide a copy of that consent order to its borrowers in March of 2009?
A. It was public record.
Q. I didn't ask that. Was a copy of the consent order provided to Corus's borrowers --

MR. TRENCH: I object --
Q. -- specifically by Corus?

MR. TRENCH: I object to the form of the question. If you mean did they actually deliver it as opposed to constructively giving notice, that might clarify the issue.
Q. I think providing a copy would actually mean delivering.

MR. TRENCH: Just want to make sure it's clear.
A. Not to my recollection.
Q. Now, on and after March of 2009 did the consent order limit the discretion of Corus Bank in any way with regard to existing loans?
A. I would say that it did. I don't really -- I have not looked at the consent order for a long time, over two years.
Q. So I think you indicated that -- by the way, was the consent order with the FDIC or the OCC, or both?
A. I think it was with the OCC.
Q. If we look at this, going back to Exhibit 10, there's reference to -- I would like to go down some of it. There's a basis number.

MR. TRENCH: You are on page 16536, right?

|  | 62 |  | 64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. GILLMAN: Yes |  | Q. And then there's a site review and it says |
| 2 | Let's sort of go through this. There's a | 2 | "SCG visited the site on 5/19/09." Who is SCG? |
| 3 | section entitled Summary, a section entitled Projec | 3 | A. That should be referring to Starwood Capital |
| 4 | Ranking. Whose project ranking is that, Corus's, the |  | Group. |
| 5 | OCC? |  | Q. So Starwood Capital Group was visiting the SB |
| 6 | ave no ide | 6 | Hotel property as early as May 19, 2009 ? |
| 7 | Q. Collateral, the next box, it has an estimated | 7 | A. That is the indication. |
| 8 | completion and then it's got a February 9, 2009 receive | 8 | Q. Do you know if that site visit was announced |
| 9 | TCO. Does that reflect that the property that was | 9 | to the borrower? |
| 0 | collateral for the loan had received its temporary | 10 | A. No, I have no knowledge. |
| 11 | certificate of occupancy on February 9, 2009? | 11 | Q. Was Starwood Capital engaged in any loan |
| 12 | A. That would be my conclusion. | 12 | acquisition discussions direct with Corus Bank in May |
| 13 | Q. You previously indicated that the loan | 13 | of 2009? |
| 14 | officer, the primary loan officer, was -- | 14 | A. Not to my knowledge. |
| 15 | ith G | 15 | Q. My question is a little bit beyond that. You |
| 16 | Q. Was Keith Gibbons. Is Keith Gibbons involved | 16 | are saying not to your knowledge. Do you know |
| 17 | in any way with CCV? | 17 | that that wasn't the case, or you don't know one way or |
| 18 | A. | 18 | the other? |
| 19 | Q. Was he ever involved with CCV? | 19 | A. I would say I don't know one way or the other. |
| 20 | A. He was employed until approximately December | 20 | There was a simultaneous process being run whereby |
| 21 | of '09. I don't think he was employed by CCV. | 21 | crus was seeking to be recapitalized by a third party |
| 22 | Q. Do you know where Keith Gibbons is? | 22 | estor and had an investment banker trying to raise |
| 23 | A. He's in Chicago. | 23 | capital. |
| 24 | Q. There's reference on the right side, there | 24 | Q. Who was the third party |
| 25 | certain documentation with regard to or information | 25 | A. I'm sorry? |
|  | 63 |  |  |
| 1 | with regard to basis and then there's a capitalization | 1 | Q. -- that was looking to recapitalize, who wa |
| 2 | and there's reference to remaining Corus loan funding |  | that third party? |
| 3 | of $\$ 8,166,674$, is that right? | 3 | A. A number |
| 4 | A. That's what it says. | 4 | came in, looked through files. I'm sure they visited |
| 5 | Q. And does that reflect that of the total loan | 5 | the sites of the assets, some of them. |
| 6 | amount, a little over $\$ 8$ million had not yet been | 6 | Q. One was Starwood? |
| 7 | funded? | 7 | A. It could have bee |
| 8 | A. That would be the conclusion I would draw. | 8 | Q. There's a specific reference here to a |
| 9 | Q. Had there been draw requests or requests for | 9 | Starwood site visit, correct? |
| 10 | funding by the borrower on that amount, all or any | 10 | A. |
| 11 | part? | 11 | Q. And there is no reference to anyone else's, is |
| 12 | A. I don't recall. | 12 | that right, any other entity? |
| 13 | Q. There's a loan summary and then there is a | 13 | A. Perhaps this was prepared by Starwood. |
| 14 | project description. Do you see that? | 14 | Q. Do you know? |
| 15 | A. Yes. | 15 | A. No. |
| 16 | Q. If you go over to the next page it has "loan | 16 | Q. There's a reference at the bottom of that site |
| 17 | update." Do you see that? | 17 | review section that says "Corus's extensive legal |
| 18 | A. Yes. | 18 | review of the sales contracts leads them to believe |
| 19 | Q. It references Corus is the sole senior lender? | 19 | that the loss of the Trump flag and the failure to open |
| 20 | A. Yes. | 20 | as a hotel does not release the buyers from their |
| 21 | Q. And that there's a $\$ 45.7$ million mezzanine | 21 | contracts." Do you see that? |
| 22 | loan originated by CBRE, do you see that? | 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | A. Yes. | 23 | Q. Who was on that extensive legal review? |
| 24 | Q. That's the SP Lender mezzanine loan, correct? | 24 | A. I don't know. I don't know exactly what |
|  | A. I believe it's an affiliate. |  | review they were referring to. |


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Q. You were the general counsel of Corus, right? |
| 2 | A. Yes, but I didn't write this. |
| 3 | Q. Well, you would have been aware if there was a |
| 4 | review of the contract to determine whether or not the |
| 5 | loss of the Trump flag and the failure to open as a |
| 6 | hotel would or would not release the buyers from the |
| 7 | contracts, right? |
| 8 | A. Are you asking me as somebody that was |
| 9 | employed at Corus in 2009? |
| 10 | Q. Sure. |
| 11 | A. I don't remember. |
| 12 | Q. Not just somebody is that was employed but |
| 13 | somebody that was employed as the general counsel. |
| 14 | A. Correct. I don't recall. And extensive legal |
| 15 | review could be quite different based on the views of |
| 16 | the author of what constitutes an extensive legal |
| 17 | review. |
| 18 | Q. Those contracts were collateral for the loan, |
| 19 | isn't that right? |
| 20 | A. I believe they were collaterally assigned to |
| 21 | support the loan obligation, the seller's interest in |
| 22 | them. |
| 23 | Q. The question as to whether or not there would |
| 24 | be an obligation to close or not would be an important |
| 25 | aspect of any collateral reviewed by Corus or anyone |
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intending to take over that loan, isn't that right?
A. It would be relevant.
Q. If you go to the next page, CCV 16538, there's a business plan, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know whose business plan this is? Is this Starwood's business plan?
A. I would surmise that it is Starwood's business plan because it was produced by Marcos and request for any due diligence materials that they had. It's labeled Project Northwest.
Q. This business plan actually is the business plan of CCV, isn't that right, with regard to the SB Hotel in Fort Lauderdale, Florida and the loan to SB Hotel?
A. Is that a question?
Q. Yes.
A. I don't know. Do you mean business plan, the general approach of trying to capitalize on the project as an investment?
Q. No. The question is, is this business plan that was produced to you by Starwood, is this the business plan being effectuated by ST Residential as the manager of CCV with regard to the SB Hotel property?

MR. TRENCH: Object to the form of the question.
A. The only business plan being effectuated at this time is foreclosure on the asset for, as a result of the various defaults.
Q. There is a reference on the borrower's summary below to CBRE, which is SP Lender as the mezzanine lender with a $\$ 45.8$ million balance. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And the plan referenced here was to foreclose as part -- the plan as part of the due diligence was to foreclose that as well, is that correct?
A. That's what it says.
Q. There's then a summary of risks and opportunities, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And one of the risks is that in addition there is a sophisticated mezzanine lender, right?
A. Where does it say that? Oh.
Q. The second bullet point, the end of the second sentence.
A. It says that, in addition there is a sophisticated mezzanine lender.
Q. Do you agree with that?
A. That CBRE is sophisticated?
Q. Yes.
A. I would say that they hired good counsel that indicates a certain level of sophistication.
Q. Let the record reflect I'm blushing.

Were the loan documents provided to Starwood Capital to conduct its due diligence review in the loan documents with regard to the SB Hotel loan?
A. I don't know.
Q. It is pretty impossible to do a due diligence without looking at the documents, isn't that right?
A. The indications that I have received are that the loan documents were only spot checked.
Q. In this interim period between the declaration of insolvency, September, and the culmination of the bid process in October, you were employed by the FDIC in its receivership capacity, right?
A. For a very brief time, and then I was transferred to Starwood. Not Starwood but project -an entity, I suppose Northwest Management who I'm currently paid by.
Q. Let's go back. I don't know that I got that.

September 11, 2009, FDIC becomes the receiver of Corus?
A. From September 11 until October 16 any salary I received was from a subcontractor, Impremus, of the

FDIC as receiver.
Q. So you became employed by Northwest Capital upon ST becoming the manager member of CCV or some earlier time?
A. It was after October 16.
Q. So October 16 would have been the culmination of that bid process that we have been talking about, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So there was a period of approximately a month when you were employed by the FDIC or a subcontractor of the FDIC prior your being employed by Northwest Capital, the ultimate winning bidder, right?

MR. TRENCH: I guess it is Northwest
Investments.
Q. Northwest Investments. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. During that time period and from before you were aware that there was an intercreditor agreement between Corus and SP Lender, right?
A. I was aware that there were intercreditor agreements on dozens of loans.
Q. And you were aware that there was a $\$ 5$ million owed in the event of an unapproved transfer, correct?
A. I doubt it.
Q. Was that a standard provision in Corus intercreditor agreements?
A. No, not at all.
Q. So I think you've indicated that Corus was and its lawyers were at least the initial drafters, but you are aware that there is a $\$ 5$ million provision in the Intercreditor Agreement at issue in this case, right?
A. I am aware that there's an issue in this case.
Q. Was the approval of that $\$ 5$ million, did that have to be approved by somebody at Corus before it was agreed to?
A. It would have probably have been approved by the loan committee.
Q. Without any input from the general counsel's office?
A. Well, it's a business term.
Q. Well, general counsel doesn't review documents that have significant terms and provisions with regard to one of its largest loans by Corus Bank?
A. Right.
Q. Is that your testimony?
A. Well, my testimony is that in it 2006 we originated I think 2 billion, maybe more. So to pick out a singular term of a single intercreditor agreement gives me more credit than I probably deserve in terms
of remembering details of loan terms. There were a lot of complicated loans being produced.
Q. This one was five percent of that total, right?
A. I don't know.
Q. A hundred some odd million, that's a big loan, right?
A. It's a big loan.
Q. Big loans get careful attention at Corus even in 2006, 2007 period, right?
A. We tried to be prudent.
Q. Do you know whether the due diligence conducted by or on behalf of the winning bidder included a review of the loan documents associated with the SB Hotel loan?
A. None of this material indicates that the loan documents were reviewed because the legal review is reflected in the document that's Bates stamped as 16541 through 16551.
Q. That just reflects a lien review, correct?
A. No. I was told that this was the product of a legal review by Pircher Nichols.
Q. Right. But the only thing that seems to be reflected in here are issues with regard to liens or possibly lawsuits, right?
A. Whatever it says.
Q. This document doesn't reflect -- strike that. Is it fair to say this reflects a public record review?
A. I don't know how they obtained the information that is summarized in this document.
Q. If you look at page 2 of 11 , which is CCV 16542, that has the section involving the SB Hotel Fort Lauderdale loan, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And there's a reflection of lien and then there's a reflection of default final judgment and then no outstanding taxes. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. That's information that one obtains from a public record review, correct?
A. I believe that that is a source for that information.
Q. Do you know -- this particular review appears to be a public record, at least a public record search at least with regard to the SB Hotel loan, correct?
A. It indicates information was summarized which is available in the public records.
Q. This doesn't tell you whether or not the due diligence included a review of the loan documents

```
themselves, does it?
    A. It doesn't it will you -- no.
    Q. Let me make it simple. In preparation for
your deposition did you inquire and make a
determination whether or not Starwood or whoever was
conducting the due diligence with regard to the SB
Hotel loan reviewed the Loan Documents associated with
that loan?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Who did you ask?
    A. Marcos.
    Q. And he told you what?
    A. Pritcher Nichols reviewed the loan documents.
    Q. So this report here doesn't reflect anything
at all having to do with a review of the Loan
Documents, does it?
    A. No, but he stated this was the report they
    received from Pritcher Nichols. This was their legal.
    Q. Have you ever conducted due diligence for any
    company with regard to the acquisition of significant
    assets?
    A. No.
    Q. Would it surprise you that it is a standard
    practice to review the loan documents, at least the
    large significant loan documents?
```

A. Well, it depends. In this transaction the -my understanding is that some loan docs were reviewed and they were found to be extremely well drafted and that they did not do extensive loan doc reviews of every single loan.
Q. And who did you get that information from?
A. I'm surmising that from a conversation I had with Richard Perry.
Q. Richard Perry is associated with an entity that was not doing the due diligence on the SB Hotel loan, correct?
A. Correct. It was a general conversation.
Q. My question is with regard to the entity -well, let me ask you.

Do you know whether or not there was a review of the Loan Documents associated with the SB Hotel loan by Starwood Capital or the parties doing the due diligence as to the bid which ultimately culminated in acquiring the 40 percent interest in CCV?
A. Not conclusively, no.

MR. GILLMAN: I think and I know you won't agree with me but just for the record think we have a right to know that, and I think there was an obligation to find that out in preparing for this corporate deposition.

## MR. TRENCH: Noted.

MR. GILLMAN: I would ask you to see if you can find me a witness or if we take a lunch break maybe the witness can contact somebody and find out.

I will tell you, I think right now I've got, I'm looking two, three hours, probably max, but I know Joe has some questions to do. Do you want to take a lunch break? We are at 12:15.

MR. TRENCH: Whatever you guys want to do.
(Recess taken in the proceedings)

## BY MR. GILLMAN:

Q. Let me show you what has been marked as Exhibit 11 and 12.
(Exhibits 11 and 12 marked for identification)
Q. I've handed you what has been marked as Exhibit 11 and 12. Exhibit 11 is SP Fort Lauderdale Lenders First Request for Production of Documents and Electronically Stored Information to Plaintiff, and Exhibit 12 is Plaintiff CCV's response to that.

Have you seen these documents before today?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you the person responsible for conducting the search to obtain the documents?
A. Yes.
Q. Did anyone assist you?
A. Yes.
Q. Who assisted you?
A. My paralegal, Armisha Bell.
Q. And that's a paralegal at --
A. At ST.
Q. Anybody else?
A. Alberto Salgado, who's a tech assistant. He used the services of Forensicon in Chicago and Elephant Outlook, which is our server.
Q. Anyone else?
A. I also -- that's it.
Q. You had previously given testimony about doing a database search using selected search terms.
A. Yes.
Q. And then doing a search of your subservicer

Trimont, and also reviewing the documents that were in the FDIC-supplied external drive, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the documents that were located there,
those documents would be documents related to the operation -- the documents that were sent over by Corus Bank through the FDIC, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Relating to the loan?

|  | 78 |  | 80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Yes. | 1 | A. No. |
| 2 | Q. And whatever operations had occurred at CCV | 2 | Q. And you were copied with this document, |
| 3 | after October of 2009, is that right? | 3 | correct? |
| 4 | A. Presumably. | 4 | A. That's what it indicates. |
| 5 | Q. Other than documents that were withheld as a | 5 | Q. Now, the address, the e-mail address is CCV |
| 6 | result of the privilege assertion, are you aware of any | 6 | partners.com. That's a CCV address? |
| 7 | documents that were requested that were not produced? | 7 | A. I think it's the address of ST Residential |
| 8 | A. No. | 8 | before ST Residential's name came into use. |
| 9 | (Exhibit 16 marked for identification) | 9 | Q. Why is this attorney-client? |
| 10 | Q. Show you what has been marked as Exhibit 16. | 10 | A. I don't know. |
| 11 | Do you recognize this? | 11 | Q. You understand that just because an attorney |
| 12 | A. This was prepared by my counsel. | 12 | gets copied on something doesn't mean that it is |
| 13 | Q. Have you seen it before today? | 13 | covered by the privilege, right? |
| 14 | A. No. | 14 | MR. TRENCH: Well -- |
| 15 | Q. I would like you to refer over to page 6. The | 15 | A. As a matter of law? |
| 16 | second document from the bottom, CCV PRIV139, is a | 16 | Q. Sure. You're a lawyer. |
| 17 | January 12, 2010 e-mail, correct? | 17 | MR. TRENCH: Let me object to the form of the |
| 18 | A. Yes. | 18 | question. He didn't bring this out as privileged, |
| 19 | Q. And the author is James Dow, right? | 19 | and there are two privileged bases. One is |
| 20 | A. Yes. | 20 | attorney-client, the other is work product. And |
| 21 | Q. He's not an attorney, is that right? | 21 | that was done by my office, not by Mr. Solomon. So |
| 22 | A. Yes. | 22 | to ask him facts about why it was placed there will |
| 23 | Q. And the recipients are Mr. Hundley, | 23 | result in him just referring to me. |
| 24 | Mr. Barkidjija, B-A-R-K-I-D-J-I-J-A and Mr. Alvarado, | 24 | Q. What was James Dow's position in January of |
| 25 | is that right? | 25 | 2010? |
|  | 79 |  | 81 |
| 1 | A. Yes, now you know how to spell it. | 1 | A. He was an asset manager. |
| 2 | Q. None of them are attorneys, right? | 2 | Q. Asset manager for who? |
| 3 | A. John Barkidjija is a attorney. | 3 | A. ST Residential. |
| 4 | Q. He's got an e-mail address at Corus Bank on | 4 | Q. Did he have any responsibility for the SB |
| 5 | January 12, 2010. Do you know why that is? | 5 | Hotel loan? |
| 6 | A. No. | 6 | A. I don't know if that loan was assigned to him |
| 7 | Q. He was a member of your general counsel team? | 7 | at that time. |
| 8 | A. No. | 8 | Q. Does he have responsibility now? |
| 9 | Q. He was hired by who? Who did he work for? | 9 | A. Yes. I previously testified that he's the |
| 10 | A. He was a loan officer at Corus Bank. | 10 | asset manager. |
| 11 | Q. So he was an attorney at Corus Bank -- excuse | 11 | Q. Do you have any understanding as to why this |
| 12 | me. He is an attorney but he was not a practicing | 12 | document from an asset manager to Mr. Hundley, et al., |
| 13 | attorney, is that right? | 13 | why this is deemed privileged? |
| 14 | A. Yes. | 14 | A. No. |
| 15 | Q. At Corus Bank he was a nonattorney loan | 15 | Q. Are you an able to tell what it is about? It |
| 16 | officer? | 16 | says "Miami workout update." Does that mean anything |
| 17 | A. He was a loan officer who was an attorney. | 17 | to you? |
| 18 | Q. And his role as a loan officer was not to give | 18 | A. It is an update on the Miami workout. |
| 19 | or receive legal advice, it was to perform the | 19 | Q. And that would be -- given the fact that this |
| 20 | functions of a loan officer? | 20 | property is not in Miami, what does that mean? |
| 21 | A. Yes. | 21 | A. He may have been reporting about a group of |
| 22 | Q. By the way, for yourself, where are you | 22 | assets that are in this area. |
| 23 | licensed? | 23 | Q. Mr. Barkidjija in January of 2010 was not |
| 24 | A. Illinois. | 24 | employed by Corus Bank, right? |
| 25 | Q. Anywhere else? | 25 | A. No. |

```
Q. And he was not employed by CCV?
    A. Yes, he was employed by ST Residential.
    Q. What was his duties at that time?
    A. He was an asset manager. I'm not sure if he
    had a special designation at that time or what his
    title was. It may have been senior vice president. He
    was a loan officer at Corus Bank.
    Q. If you would go on to page 9, the last two
    items on page 9, the author is Mr. Dow and he's sending
    an e-mail in May of 2010 to Jonathan Pertchik. Who is
    he?
        A. Chief operating officer.
        Q. Of?
        A. ST Residential.
        Q. Not a lawyer?
        A. No. Oh, yes, he's also a lawyer.
        Q. Is he a practicing lawyer?
        A. No.
        Q. This wasn't being sent for legal advice?
        A. No.
        Q. This was sent to advise him in his business
    capacity?
        A. Yes.
        Q. Mr. Hundley we have already talked about.
    Ballestas, who is V. Ballestas?
```

    A. Victor.
    Q. B-A-L-L-E-S-T-A-S, who is that?
    A. He's an asset manager.
    Q. Not a lawyer?
    A. No.
    Q. And you are cc'd, correct?
    A. Yes.
    Q. There's reference to meetings with Stillman
    and Ferretti, do you see that?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Who is Ferretti?
    A. He was a principal on a project known as
    Artecity.
        Q. Known an as what?
        A. Artecity. It is in South Beach.
        Q. Spell it, A-R-T --
        A. A-R-T-E-C-I-T-Y. Art City some people say.
        Q. Go to the next page, page 10. If you look at
        all of the items before the last one, the author and
        the recipients are not lawyers, or at least not
        practicing lawyers giving or receiving legal advice,
        right?
            A. Yes.
        Q. You were copied on those, correct?
        A. Yes.
    Q. Did you participate other than to get copied?
A. I don't know. What does participate mean?
Q. Well, you received a copy of the e-mail. Did you do anything as a result of receiving it?
A. I read the e-mails that I get and I would think about them.
Q. And other than reading and thinking about them, did you do anything else?
A. Often I make phone calls after I receive an e-mail and talk to the people that sent the e-mail.
Q. The next page, page 11, the first four items, can you take a look and satisfy yourself that the author and the recipient are business people getting and receiving business information?
A. Yes.
Q. You're copied, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Other than having been copied, do you recall doing anything in conjunction with those e-mails?
A. Well, as I stated, I often did something in response to e-mails. But I cannot remember what I did on May 16, 2010 in response to this particular e-mail.
Q. At page 21, all of the items on this page, the author and the recipient are business people receiving business information, is that right?
A. No.
Q. Who is not?
A. Peter Freund is a attorney.
Q. Where is that? Is that the middle -- the top one, Peter Freund with ST Residential?

MR. TRENCH: He's actually on almost all of them or is on all of them.
Q. What was his role in this?
A. He's one --
Q. Does he work for you?
A. Yes.
Q. Go to the next page. Okay. We're done with that exhibit. I would like you to go back if you will to the complaint, which is Exhibit 6. I'd like you to turn if you would to paragraph 17 at page 8. Paragraph 17 says that the FDIC sold the Loan, and the loan is defined in this complaint to be the Loan to SB Hotel, okay? So it says the FDIC sold the Loan and Loan Documents to plaintiff, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's the transaction in the LCSA, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it says the FDIC endorsed the note by Allong, is that correct?

|  | 86 |  | 88 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Yes. | 1 | A. Yes. |
| 2 | Q. And then assigned the mortgage? | 2 | Q. So included in the transfer from FDIC-R to CCV |
| 3 | A. Yes. | 3 | was the loan, correct? |
| 4 | Q. -- the ALR and other loan documents to | 4 | A. Yes. |
| 5 | plaintiff, CCV, by an assignment of mortgage and other | 5 | Q. And that included the promissory note? |
| 6 | loan documents, correct? | 6 | A. Yes. |
| 7 | A. Yes. | 7 | Q. The mortgage? |
| 8 | Q. And the Allong and assignment is composite | 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | Exhibit H. That's what it says, right? | 9 | Q. And the Intercreditor Agreement between Corus |
| 10 | A. It says that. | 10 | Bank and SP Lender, right? |
| 11 | Q. Let's go to composite Exhibit 8. The first | 11 | A. Originally. |
| 12 | page is the Allong, right? | 12 | Q. But as of the date of this transfer it was |
| 13 | A. Yes. | 13 | between FDIC Receiver and SP Lender, right? |
| 14 | Q. The second is a document entitled "Assignment | 14 | A. Yes. |
| 15 | of mortgage and other loan documents." Do you see | 15 | MR. TRENCH: Wait. Just -- you lost me on |
| 16 | that? | 16 | that one. |
| 17 | A. Yes. | 17 | MR. GILLMAN: I don't need to lose you. |
| 18 | Q. This says when is prepared and when recorded | 18 | MR. TRENCH: I understand. I object to the |
| 19 | returned to Corus Construction Venture, LLC 591, West | 19 | form of the question. Would you repeat it or read |
| 20 | Putnam Avenue, Greenwich, Connecticut, Attention Eric | 20 | it back. |
| 21 | Franklin, Esq. Do you see that? | 21 | (Record read) |
| 22 | A. Yes. | 22 | MR. TRENCH: That's the question I don't |
| 23 | Q. Whose address is 591 West Putnam? | 23 | understand. What were you asking was between FDIC |
| 24 | A. Starwood Capital. | 24 | and SP Lender? |
| 25 | Q. And Eric Franklin is a attorney for Starwood | 25 | MR. GILLMAN: David, if and when I put you |
|  | 87 |  | 89 |
| 1 | Capital? | 1 | under oath and have your deposition -- |
| 2 | A. I think he has a separate law firm but | 2 | MR. TRENCH: Okay, I object to the form of the |
| 3 | essentially works for Starwood Capital. | 3 | question. |
| 4 | Q. If you go down to the last paragraph on page | 4 | MR. GILLMAN: I understand that. The witness |
| 5 | 1, and it says "Subject to the terms and conditions of | 5 | obviously understood and answered. |
| 6 | the Loan Contribution Sale Agreement assignor," that's | 6 | MR. TRENCH: I don't know whether he obviously |
| 7 | the FDIC receiver, correct -- | 7 | understood it or not. |
| 8 | A. Yes. | 8 | BY MR. GILLMAN: |
| 9 | Q. -- "does hereby grant, bargain, sell, assign, | 9 | Q. Let's turn if we can for a moment to Exhibit |
| 10 | transfer and set over to assignee," that's CCV, | 10 | 4, which is the Intercreditor Agreement. Can you get |
| 11 | correct? | 11 | that in front of you. Do you have it? |
| 12 | A. Yes. | 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | Q. -- "its successors and assigns," correct? | 13 | Q. If you would go to the first page. We have |
| 14 | A. Yes. | 14 | already discussed that this is dated December 15, 2006, |
| 15 | Q. -- "all of assignor's right, title and | 15 | right? |
| 16 | interest in and to the other recorded Loan Documents | 16 | A. Yes. |
| 17 | described on Exhibit A attached hereto," right? | 17 | Q. Is it correct that there was a total lending |
| 18 | A. That's what it says. | 18 | to the borrower of approximately 180 some-odd million, |
| 19 | Q. And if you go to Exhibit A to the assignment | 19 | 139 of which was the loan from Corus and 45.7 million |
| 20 | included in the transferred and assigned documents is | 20 | of which was from SP Lender? |
| 21 | the Intercreditor Agreement, item 4, right? | 21 | A. Yes. |
| 22 | A. Yes. | 22 | Q. And that was done on the same day, correct? |
| 23 | Q. And this reflects that that Intercreditor | 23 | A. Yes. |
|  | Agreement had previously been recorded in the public records at Broward County, is that right? | 24 | Q. And it was part of a unified financing to the borrower correct? |
|  | records at Broward County, is that right? | 25 | borrower, correct? |


|  | 90 |  | 92 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Unified? | 1 | disposition of either directly or indirectly by |
| 2 | Q. Yes. What I mean by that is is it your | 2 | operation of law or otherwise." Have I read that |
| 3 | understanding that the borrower required both loans in | 3 | rrect? |
| 4 | der to proceed with the project? | 4 | A. Yes. |
| 5 | A. I believe it was part of the budget. | 5 | Q. And you understood that to be the definition |
| 6 | Q. So without the SP Lender loan Corus Bank | 6 | of the term transfer as used in the Intercreditor |
| 7 | wouldn't have closed its $\$ 139$ million loan, correct? | 7 | Agreement? |
| 8 | A. Yes. | 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | Q. And this Intercreditor Agreement was designed | 9 | Q. The Intercreditor Agreement I think you |
| 10 | to and did establish the rights and obligations as | 10 | already indicated was recorded and there was provision |
|  | etween the party identified as the Senior Lender and | 11 | for it to be recorded on page 12, right? |
| 12 | SP Lender identified as the Junior Lender, is that | 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | right? | 13 | Q. So anybody doing a review of the public record |
| 14 | A. Yes. | 14 | with regard to this Loan would find the Intercreditor |
| 15 | Q. If you go to the second page it says that this | 15 | Agreement and have it and its terms available for their |
| 16 | an agreement between Corus Bank, NA and its | 16 | review, is that right? |
| 17 | uccessors and assigns in its capacity as a lender, | 17 | A. It was there. |
| 18 | right? This is page 2 at the very beginning. | 18 | Q. It and all of its terms, right? |
| 19 | A. Yes. | 19 | A. Yes. |
| 20 | Q. And the term "Senior Lender" is actually later | 20 | Q. Let's go over to page 18. Page 18 has a |
|  | defined if you go to page 7 of the agreement, and | 21 | Section 8 entitled Senior Indebtedness, is that right? |
| 22 | "Senior Lender as used in this intercreditor agreement | 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | is defined in the introductory paragraph to this | 23 | Q. And subsection A is Limitation on Transfer, is |
| 24 | agreement." Have I read that right? | 24 | that right? |
| 25 | A. Yes. | 25 | A. Yes. |
|  | 91 |  | 93 |
| 1 | Q. So the defined term Senior Lender as used | 1 | Q. And there is a limitation and what occurs if |
| 2 | throughout this document is Corus Bank, NA, together | 2 | there is a transfer of the senior indebtedness or any |
| 3 | with its successors and assigns in its capacity as a | 3 | of the Senior Loan Documents without the consent of the |
| 4 | lender, right? | 4 | Junior Lender, correct? |
| 5 | A. Yes. | 5 | A. Yes. |
| 6 | Q. Under the Intercreditor Agreement there is | 6 | Q. Included within the Senior Loan Documents |
| 7 | actually a definition of the term Affiliate on 3, | 7 | would be the Intercreditor Agreement it itself, right? |
| 8 | correct? | 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | A. Yes. | 9 | Q. And that would include the loan, the mortgage, |
| 10 | Q. And read through that. That's a standard | 10 | all of the lien information, guarantees, et cetera, is |
| 11 | definition of that term, correct, the term affiliate? |  | that right? |
| 12 | A. Yes. | 12 | A. Uh-huh. Yes. |
| 13 | Q. There's a definition of the term Control on | 13 | Q. There has been a transfer of the SB Hotel |
| 14 | page 4, and that's a typical and standard definition of | 14 | loan, the Senior Loan and the Senior Loan Documents |
| 15 | the term control, right? | 15 | done without the consent of SP Lender, right? |
| 16 | A. It is a definition of control. I really don't | 16 | A. The transfer to the receiver was without |
| 17 | know how control is always or typically defined. | 17 | consent. |
| 18 | Q. But you agree that that is an accepted | 18 | Q. And the transfer by the receiver to CCV was |
| 19 | definition of the term control? | 19 | also without consent, right? |
| 20 | A. I would say that it is a reasonable definition | 20 | A. I believe under federal statutes that consent |
| 21 | of control. | 21 | is not required. |
| 22 | Q. Go over to page 8. There's a definition of | 22 | Q. That's not my question. The issue isn't, and |
| 23 | the defined term Transfer: "The assignment, pledge, | 23 | respectfully my question doesn't have anything to do |
| 24 | conveyance, sale, transfer, mortgage, encumbrance, |  | whether consent was required or whether it was |
|  | grant of the security interest, participation or other |  | requested or not. |
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|  | 94 |  | 96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | As the designee of CCV you agree that no | 1 | A. I don't know. |
| 2 | consent was sought or obtained from SP Lender with | 2 | Q. So you don't know one way or the other under |
| 3 | regard to the transfer of he Senior Loan and the Senior | 3 | those circumstances? |
| 4 | Loan Documents to CCV? | 4 | A. I haven't reviewed general hornbook law for |
| 5 | A. Yes. | 5 | quite sometime. |
| 6 | Q. Under the clear and unambiguous provision of | 6 | Q. You would agree that to the extent that |
| 7 | Section 8A in the event of an unconsented or a | 7 | general law would say that in the absence of a |
| 8 | nonconsented to transfer, SP Lender is entitled to | 8 | specified payment date where a payment is required it |
| 9 | receive $\$ 5$ million, right? | 9 | would be due within a reasonable time after the event |
| 10 | A. From who? | 10 | causing the payment to be due, right? |
| 11 | Q. I didn't ask that. Well, I will ask. From | 11 | MR. TRENCH: Object to the form of the |
| 12 | the Senior Lender. Would you agree with that? | 12 | question. |
| 13 | A. It says that, in the event of a transfer by | 13 | A. I think you are asking me to give a legal |
|  | the Senior Lender Senior Lender shall deliver \$5 | 14 | conclusion |
| 15 | million to Junior Lender as Junior Lender's full | 15 | Q. Go over to page 26. The agreement is clear |
| 16 | liquidated damages for such transfer. | 16 | that the agreement shall inure to the benefit of and |
| 17 | Q. So would it be correct that in the event that | 17 | shall be binding upon the parties and their respective |
| 18 | there is a transfer of he Senior Loan and/or the Senior | 18 | successors and assigns, correct? |
| 19 | Loan Documents then Senior Lender is obligated to | 19 | A. Yes. |
| 20 | deliver \$5 million to the Junior Lender? | 20 | Q. And you will agree that CCV is a successor to |
|  | A. Not always. | 21 | this Intercreditor Agreement, correct? |
| 22 | Q. Tell me when it doesn't. | 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | A. When the transferee is the FDIC's receiver. | 23 | MR. GILLMAN: Why don't we take a break. |
| 24 | Q. Well you are making a legal conclusio | 24 | Lunch is her |
| 25 | A. I think you are asking me a legal question. | 25 | (Recess taken in the proceedings) |
|  | 95 |  | 97 |
| 1 | Q. No. I'm asking you do you agree that' | 1 | AFTERNOONSESSION |
| 2 | the document says? | 2 | (1:59 p.m.) |
| 3 | A. I -- | 3 | JOEL SOLOMON, resumed. |
| 4 | Q. Let me try this way. The document, the | 4 | BY MR. GILLMAN: |
| 5 | Intercreditor Agreement, would you agree that it | 5 | Q. Ready to start? |
| 6 | provides that in the event that he Senior Loan and | 6 | A. Ready. |
| 7 | the Senior Loan Documents are transferred without the | 7 | Q. Mr. Solomon, you understand you are still |
| 8 | consent of the Junior Lender, SP Lender, then the | 8 | under oath? |
| 9 | Senior Lender is obligated to deliver \$5 million to SP | 9 | A. Yes. |
| 10 | Lender? That's what the document says, right? | 10 | Q. During the break did you have any substantive |
| 11 | A. That's what the document says. | 11 | discussions with regard to your deposition with anyone? |
| 2 | Q. And that's clear and unambiguous, right? | 12 | A. My attorney and I discussed the case |
| 13 | A. In the document. | 13 | generally. That's been it. |
| 14 | Q. So it is a yes to my question? Yes, in the | 14 | Q. As a result of that discussion is there |
| 15 | document, right? | 15 | anything you want to change, any answer, or do you |
| 16 | A. Yes, in the document it's clear and | 16 | stand on your answers given this morning? |
| 17 | unambiguous. | 17 | A. I stand on my answers. |
| 18 | Q. All right. Now, when that $\$ 5$ million is | 18 | Q. Let's turn if we will to Exhibit 5, which is |
| 19 | required to be delivered is not specified, correct? | 19 | the LCSA. I think we already established that you |
| 20 | A. I don't see a specification for when the funds | 20 | personally didn't have any participation in the |
| 21 | should be delivered. | 21 | drafting or the review or negotiation of Exhibit 5, the |
| 22 | Q. And you are fam | 22 | LCSA, is that right? |
| 23 | general hornbook law where there is a payment | 23 | A. Yes. |
| 24 | obligation but no specified date, then the payment is | 24 | Q. As the designee for CCV what, if anything, |
|  | within a reasonable period of time, is that correct? | 25 | have you done to prepare you to testify with regard to |

```
the LCSA?
A. I've worked with it generally on and off for the last couple of years.
Q. Have you had any conferences or discussions with anyone to prepare for your deposition specifically with regard to the LCSA?
A. No.
Q. The intent of the document you will agree is gleaned by the words used, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And this was drafted by sophisticated parties and their counsel and reviewed and approved, is that right?
A. I would presume.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that it was not reviewed by counsel and sophisticated parties?
A. I have no reason to believe that it was not.
Q. The transaction here where the FDIC is appointed as receiver and a month goes by and the FDIC establishes a limited liability company and then the winner of the bid process comes in and buys all or a part of the LLC's membership interest, that's what happened here, in basic terms, is that right?
A. In basic terms.
Q. Do you have any information or knowledge as to
```

whether or not that form of transaction has been used by the FDIC in any other situation or circumstance?
A. Yes, I believe it has.
Q. Do you know how many?
A. No.
Q. Can you give me an example?
A. It's on their Web site. I think it is referred to as a structured transaction.
Q. Was that on their Web site before or after the Corus? Do you know if it was the first one or if this was a transaction done after others had been completed?
A. Others might have been done but information about it may not have been posted yet. This is kind of a ground-breaking approach on this scale.
Q. If you turn to the first page, the first page is the title page reflecting what the document is and the date, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. There are certain redactions in this document including on the second page within the table of contents Section 4.16. What was redacted?
A. I would have to look at the unredacted version to be able to tell you what was redacted.
Q. Do you know why it was redacted?
A. I think the redactions that were followed were
the redactions made by the FDIC on their Web site on the posting of this document on their Web site.
Q. I'm unclear about one thing. This is an agreement between the FDIC as receiver and Corus Construction Venture, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Corus Construction Venture has an unredacted copy of this, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. My document request was to Corus Construction

Venture. Do you know why an unredacted form was not provided?
A. I would have to consult with counsel to see what --
Q. I'm just asking if you know?
A. I don't know.
Q. Did you play any part in the decision to redact?
A. I recall general discussions.
Q. So why was this redacted?
A. Again, I'd have to defer to counsel's decision.
Q. No, I'm trying to find out the factual basis for it if you know. You said you had some participation. For example, the Section 4.16 there's a
block out and then the word "Loan." Do you know why that was blocked out?

MR. TRENCH: Let me mention something which may help clear this up. This is a document which we got off the Web site. If you look at Mr. Carver's filing on behalf of the FDIC, he attaches this as an exhibit, the unredacted version of this.

MR. GILLMAN: Well, I'll go look at that. Q. My question is why CCV did not provide an unredacted -- if it was redacted because of some reason CCV has I'd like to know what it is.

MR. GILLMAN: David, you are not telling me that CCV didn't have an unredacted copy, are you?

MR. TRENCH: What I'm telling you is we got a package of materials and produced what we had. I didn't look for an unredacted copy. In fact I thought I saw an unredacted copy somewhere and it may have been in Chris Carver's attachment.

MR. GILLMAN: We'll go on and deal with this.
MR. TRENCH: These redactions were not done by us. They were done by -- when you go to the Web site and take it down, the FDIC had posted it with those redactions.
BY MR. GILLMAN:

|  | 102 |  | 104 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q. Does CCV maintain its own files? | 1 | Q. And included in that is the SB Hotel \$139 |
| 2 | A. Trimont maintains the files. | 2 | million loan, mortgage and all the associated loan |
| 3 | Q. So Trimont would maintain execution copies of | 3 | documents including the Intercreditor Agreement with SP |
| - | all these documents, right? | 4 | Lender, is that right? |
| 5 | A. No, we have copies of those documents. | 5 | A. Yes. |
| 6 | Q. So CCV, you, ST Residential, right? | 6 | Q. The third whereas says, "whereas after |
| 7 | A. Yes. | 7 | conducting a sealed bid sale for a membership |
| 8 | Q. ST Residential maintains execution copies of | 8 | interest" -- |
| 9 | all of these documents? | $\bigcirc$ | R. TRENCH: Fourth whereas. |
| 10 | A. Y | 10 | Q. The fourth, excuse me. "Whereas after |
|  | Q. And that would include an unredacted copy of | 11 | conducting a sealed bid sale for membership interest in |
| 12 | the LCSA, correct? | 12 | the company representing 40 percent of the total |
| 13 | A. Yes. | 13 | outstanding equity interest of the company," and it is |
| 14 | Q. Do you know why that wasn't provided? | 14 | called the tranferred LLC interest, "the receiver |
| 15 | A. I do not. | 15 | selected Northwest Investments, LLC, referred to as the |
| 16 | Q. Let's go to the first page after the table of | 16 | sponsor as the successful bidder pursuant to the bid |
| 17 | contents, which is headed by the words Loan | 17 | submitted by it and the sponsor has deposited |
| 18 | Contribution and Sale Agreement. At the time that this | 18 | \$53,440,000 with the FDIC receiver." Is that right? |
| 19 | Loan Contribution and Sale Agreement was executed and | 19 | A. With the initial member. |
| 20 | ectuated the FDIC was still the sole member of CCV, | 20 | Q. Which is the FDIC receiver, correct? |
| 21 | ght? | 21 | A. Yes. |
| 22 | A. Could you repeat the question | 22 | Q. The total purchase price bid was over a |
| 23 | Q. At the time this LCSA was executed and the | 23 | billion dollars, is that right? |
| 24 | transfer occurred to CCV, the FDIC-R was still the | 24 | A. I don't know what total price means. |
| 25 | initial and sole member of CCV, right? | 25 | Q. The total amount bid by what is referred to as |
|  | 103 |  | 105 |
| 1 | A. I believe that's correct. | 1 | the sponsor, Northwest Investments, LLC, is that right? |
| 2 | Q. If you go to the next page, the first full | 2 | A. No, I don't think so. |
| 3 | whereas on that page says "Whereas pursuant to the | 3 | Q. What was the total bid? |
| 4 | limited liability company interest sale and assignment | 4 | A. I think the bid was cash and then the number |
| 5 | agreement dated the same day, the initial member, the | 5 | that you are positing you have to back into based on |
| 6 | FDIC, agreed to sell and transfer 40 percent of its | 6 | the debt portion of the deal and the percentage |
| 7 | interest, correct? | 7 | ownership that was being purchased. |
| 8 | A. Yes. | 8 | Q. The potential value to the sponsor was over a |
| 9 | (Exhibit 17 marked for identification) | 9 | billion dollars, is that right? |
| 10 | Q. Showing you what has been marked as Exhibit 17 | 10 | A. I don't know what that means. |
| 11 | and that's a document CCV 7393 through 7407. Is that | 11 | Q. What does the term sponsor mean? |
| 12 | the Limited Liability Company Interest and Assignment | 12 | A. That depends on the context. |
| 13 | Agreement that we have just had reference to in the | 13 | Q. How about in the context here? |
| 14 | Loan Contribution and Sale Agreement? | 14 | A. Where's here? |
| 15 | A. I believe it is. | 15 | Q. In this Exhibit 17. |
| 16 | Q. Let's take a moment and look at this Limited | 16 | A. What's the question? |
| 17 | Liability Company Interest and Assignment Agreement. | 17 | Q. The term sponsor, does it have any meaning |
| 18 | So on October 16, 2009 there is a transaction | 18 | other than just simply being a defined term meaning |
| 19 | in which through the LCSA the FDIC as receiver | 19 | Northwest Investments? |
| 20 | transfers and contributes a substantial number of loans | 20 | A. If it does I would have to review the entire |
| 21 | and loan documents to CCV , right? | 21 | document to glean any other meaning. Here it seems to |
| 22 | A. Yes. | 22 | be a defined term for Northwest Investments. |
| 23 | Q. And these are the loans of the former Corus | 23 | Q. As part of this transfer of 40 percent the |
| 24 | Bank, right? | 24 | FDIC-R, the initial member, also transferred |
| 25 | A. Right. | 25 | management, correct? |
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A. Yes.
Q. Let's go back if we can to the LCSA, Exhibit
5. On October 16, 2009 the FDIC-R transferred the SB
Hotel Loan and all of the Loan Documents to CCV, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And is that is a defined term called the Closing Date, right?
A. What was the defined date?
Q. October 16, 2009?
MR. TRENCH: Do you have that reference?
Q. Go to page 4 , Closing is a defined term meaning the consummation of the transactions contemplated in LLC Interest Sale Agreement, right?
MR. TRENCH: Right.
MR. GILLMAN: And if you go to the LLC interest sale agreement --
Q. And if you go to the LLC Interest Sale Agreement, which we have marked as Exhibit 17, you will see that that date is October 16,2009 , correct?
MR. TRENCH: It says it is made, that's right.
MR. GILLMAN: Now I got your testimony. Let's get CCV's.
MR. TRENCH: Okay.
Q. Do you agree that the Closing Date, that
```

defined term within the LCSA, the Closing Date is October 16, 2009?
A. Well, it says "the closing date shall mean the date on which the closing occurs."
Q. And Closing shall mean the consummation of the transactions contemplated in the LLC Interest Sale Agreement, correct?
A. It says that.
Q. And the first page of the LLC interest Sale and Assignment Agreement defines Closing Date as $10 / 16 / 09$, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So going through that process in the LCSA, the closing date is October 16, 2009, correct?

MR. TRENCH: Object to the form of the
question.
Q. Having reviewed these documents, sir, what is the closing date as referenced in the LCSA?
A. I believe the closing date is October 16, 2009.
Q. Go on to page 5, there's a term, Excluded Liabilities, and it has meaning given in Section 2.2, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it fair to say that what happened on

October 16, 2009 is FDIC-R transferred to CCV and CCV accepted all of the loans and the obligations associated with the loans subject to an exclusion of the defined term Excluded Liabilities?

MR. TRENCH: Object to the form of the question.
Q. As you're thinking I'm going to let the record reflect that during your thought process the witness has written in red ink on the original exhibit so that the marks that appear on the original exhibit in red are those of the witness, is that right?
A. Yes. Sorry. I didn't realize this was the original exhibit.
Q. That's fine. It is not an original document, it is just an original exhibit. That's okay.
A. The red pen works better than the blue.
Q. Do you recall the question?
A. No.

MR. GILLMAN: Would you read it back.
(Question read by the court reporter)
MR. TRENCH: And I objected to the form of the question.
A. I don't know how to answer that question.
Q. Yes or no would be helpful.
A. Well, is it fair to say that what happened on

## 109

October 16, 2009 --
Q. I'll rephrase. By this transaction the LCSA, Loans, Loan Documents, Obligations of the FDIC-R that had been obligations of Corus were transferred to CCV subject to a carveout of Excluded Liabilities?

MR. TRENCH: I object to the form of the question.
Q. Is that right?
A. No.
Q. So what was done?
A. Well, again it was a complex transaction. I
think you're trying to distill a very lengthy legal agreement into a sentence and I don't think it's a fair characterization of everything that legally occurred on that date.
Q. Well, then let's back down. I don't care about everything that happened on that date. Right now I'm focused on the LCSA, the Loan Contribution Sale Agreement. The Loan Contribution Sale Agreement pursuant to this, there was a transfer to CCV and an acceptance by CCV of certain things, is that right?
A. Generally.
Q. Those certain things included loans, loan documents, and related documents that had previously been owned by Corus Bank, correct?


MR. TRENCH: I object to the form of the question. The document speaks for itself but if you can answer go ahead.
Q. Is that correct?
A. In a broad sense that's what occurred.
Q. Included in what was transferred to CCV was

SB Hotel loan and all of the Loan Documents and other ociated documents, correct?

MR. TRENCH: I object to the form of the

MR. GILLMAN: I don't need to know why.
A. You know, I don't think that it's reasonable summary statement of what was included and what was transferred to CCV. The document has pages and pages liabilities assumed by the company, and it says "The company hereby assumes and agrees to perform and pay all of the Obligations." Obligations is a defined So --
Q. All right, let's go through it. Let's try to break this down. You've referenced Section 2.2, and that's titled Liabilities Assumed by the Company. The
company being CCV, right?
A. Yes.
Q. But before we get to liabilities we actually have to have the contribution and sale, and that occurred on 2.1, correct, Section 2.1?
A. Yes.
Q. So Section 2.1 provides: "Terms and conditions. The initial member," that's FDIC-R, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. "Hereby conveys to the company," that's CCV, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. -- and "the company hereby acquires and accepts from the initial member," CCV acquires and accepts from FDIC-R, right --
A. Yes.
Q. -- "without recourse by way of a sale to the extent of the principal amount of the purchase money notes and otherwise as a capital contribution in either case without representation or warranty expressed or implied, all right, title and interest of the initial member of the FDIC whether held directly or indirectly
A. Yes.
Q. So what is conveyed by the FDIC and accepted by CCV is under Sub A, the Loans, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And Loans is a defined term, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. "Including without limitation all acquired collateral equity and other interest in ownership entities, REO property, notes," read it so far?
A. Yes.
Q. It also includes the other Loan Documents and Related Agreements?
A. I lost you.
Q. In the parenthetical, "the loans including without limitation all acquired collateral, equity and other interest in other entities, REO property notes, the other Loan documents and Related Agreements," correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Loan Documents is a defined term, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Related Agreements is a defined term, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it says "including all future advances made with respect thereto effective as of the Closing Date and all rights in the collateral pursuant
to the collateral documents," right?
A. Yes.
Q. We have already established that the closing date is October 16, 2009, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So let's go take a look at the definition of the term "The Loans." That appears on page 7, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. "Loan. Defined term shall mean any loan, loan participation, ownership entity" and it goes on, and please read it, and then it says "or other related asset or any related agreement," correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And included in Related Agreements with regard to the SB Hotel loan would be the Intercreditor Agreement; that's a related agreement, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So then we have "Loan Documents shall mean all documents, agreements, certificates, instruments and other writings." Included within the Loan Documents is the Intercreditor Agreement, right?

It is not a trick question so maybe I can help you out.
(Exhibit 18 marked for identification)
Q. I'm going to give you what has been marked as

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Exhibit 18. You've looked at this before because it is |
| 2 | an exhibit to the complaint, but this is the Assignment |
| 3 | of Mortgage and other Loan Documents. And if you will |
| 4 | recall, and please look, that included within the loan |
| 5 | documents that were assigned to and accepted by CCV, |
| 6 | you go to Exhibit A is the Subordination and |
| 7 | Intercreditor Agreement, right? |
| 8 | A. Agreed. |
| 9 | Q. This LCSA is the document by which the |
| 10 | Intercreditor Agreement was transferred to CCV and CCV |
| 11 | accepted, correct? |
| 12 | A. Yes. |
| 13 | Q. So now we were talking about what got |
| 14 | transferred. So what gets transferred and what was |
| 15 | accepted by CCV is the loans, the other loan documents, |
| 16 | effective as of closing date, and that included the |
| 17 | Intercreditor Agreement, right? |
| 18 | A. Yes. |
| 19 | Q. Now this goes on in Article 2 to have a |
| 20 | separate section entitled, Section 2.2 "Liabilities |
| 21 | assumed by the Company." Do you see that? |
| 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | Q. And that's liabilities assumed by CCV, |
| 24 | correct? |
| 25 | A. Yes. |

Q. It says "The company hereby assumes and agrees to perform and pay all of the Obligations," right?
A. Yes.
Q. Obligations is capitalized, it is a defined term, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's go back to, now, page 9. Page 9 defines the term Obligations, right?
A. It does.
Q. "Shall mean all obligations, commitments and liabilities relating to a loan." Have I read that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Including within the defined term Loan, as you have testified, is the Intercreditor Agreement, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it goes on to say or --

MR. TRENCH: Well, you skipped a couple.
Q. "All obligations, commitments and liabilities relating to a Loan and arising, or (solely with respect to contractual commitments becoming due or payable after the closing date in accordance with their terms) becoming due or payable after the closing date," right?
A. It says that.
Q. The obligation to pay the $\$ 5$ million arises as
a result of a transfer that is made without the consent of SP Lender under the Intercreditor Agreement, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's a contractual commitment within the Intercreditor Agreement, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that becomes due or payable after the closing date, right?
A. No.
Q. No? When does it become due or payable?
A. On the closing date.
Q. We have already established in the Intercreditor Agreement that there is no defined payment time, correct? We already went through that.
A. Right.
Q. And the issue is whether when there is no defined payment time the law will infer that it will be paid within a reasonable period of time, correct?

MR. TRENCH: Object to the form of the question.

MR. GILLMAN: I'll rephrase.
Q. I want you to assume that where a contract does not provide a specific date for payment that the law will infer that payment will be made within a reasonable time of that date. I want you to assume
that to be the case.
A. Why?

MR. TRENCH: I object.
Q. Because I'm representing to you that that's what the law will be.

MR. TRENCH: And I object to the form of the question.
Q. I'll rephrase. If, if the law is that in the absence of a defined payment date that the required payment will be made within a reasonable time, you would agree, wouldn't you, that that payment would become due or payable after the closing date?

MR. TRENCH: Object to the form of the question.
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. I believe that the payment became due on the closing date.
Q. Based on what?
A. Because the transfer occurred on the closing date, it became due.
Q. Yes. But under the Intercreditor Agreement it doesn't say when the payment is required to be made; there is no specific time period, right?
A. Right. So that term is -- you're asking me to


|  | 122 |  | 124 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Excluded Liabilities. Do you see that? |  | Was the $\$ 5$ million required to be paid on the |
| 2 | I on't think I testified that the transfer of |  | closing date? |
| 3 | the intercreditor was the obligation |  | A. |
| 4 | Q. No, I think your testimony is what it is and |  | Q. Was it required to be paid on the closing |
| 5 | whatever it is you are not recanting that testimony, |  |  |
| 6 | t? Ill rephr |  | A. It was payable. |
| 7 | MR. TRENCH: Objection |  | Q. We are going to keep going till I get an |
| 8 | characterization | 8 | swer. Do you want to hear my question again? |
| 9 | MR. GILLMAN: Strike that | 9 | yable. That's my |
| 10 | MR. TRENCH: Strike that | 0 |  |
| 11 | MR. GILLMAN: David, don't point your finger. | 11 | Q. Was the $\$ 5$ million required to be paid on |
| 12 | ou are getting testy. | 2 | October 16, 2009, the defined Closing Date? |
| 13 | nky | 13 | A. I believe it was payable. |
| 14 | LMAN: No, I'm being sweet. | 14 | Q. Was it required to be paid on October 16, |
| 15 | MR. TRENCH: I hate to hear when he is grumpy. | 15 | 2009? And I'd like to get a yes or no or I'm going to |
| 16 | BY MR. Gll |  | e judge. |
| 17 | Q. Mr. Solomon, the testimony you have previously | 7 | MR. TRENCH: I object to the form of the |
| 18 | given with regard to the terms and circumstances, you | 18 | question. |
| 19 | are not recanting that testim | 19 | A. Can you repeat the question. |
| 20 | A. Well, if there was a misunderstanding by me in | 20 | Q. Was the $\$ 5$ million required by any agreement |
| 21 | which I testified inadvertently that the transfe | 21 | to be paid on October 16, 2009? |
| 22 | ame the obligations as defined, then I'm reca | 2 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | it. That's not my intent. I do not think that the | 23 | Q. What agreement? |
| 24 | transfer was becoming part of the obligations. | 24 | A. The Intercreditor Agreement. |
| 25 | Q. And you don't think it why? | 25 | Q. Let's go back to the Intercreditor Agreement. |
|  | 123 |  |  |
|  | A. Because the definition of Oblig | 1 | understand the Intercreditor Agreement does |
| 2 | Q. We already went through the definition of | 2 | not specify a date. |
| 3 | Obligations. | 3 | Q. Time out. Well, the Intercreditor Agreement |
| 4 | A. Right | 4 | oes not say that the $\$ 5$ million is payable and |
| 5 | Q. So now you want to change it? | 5 | required to be paid on the day of the transfer, does |
| 6 | A. No. I did not want to speculate or draw legal | 6 |  |
| 7 | conclusions about the meaning of the words other than | 7 | MR. TRENCH: I object to the form of the |
| 8 | the meaning that is stated in the definit | 8 | question. |
| 9 | Q. All right. And that's what you intended to do | 9 | A. We can go back to the intercreditor and review |
| 10 | by your prior testimony. You weren't attributing it to | 10 |  |
| 11 | a particular aspect, you were just giving your | 11 | Q. We already did that at length before. Do you |
| 12 | definition, your understanding of the definition of | 12 | want to withdraw the testimony you gave earlier? |
| 13 | Obligations as it appears on page 9 of the LCSA, is | 13 | A. No. |
| 14 | that correct? | 14 | Q. There's no date in the intercreditor for that |
| 15 | A. | 15 | payment, is there? |
| 16 | Q. Okay. I'm going to -- I think your testimony | 16 | A. There is -- |
| 17 | is what it is. If you want to recant it please do so. | 17 | R. TRENCH: Asked and answered. Objection. |
| 18 | But you gave some extensive testimony on the term | 18 | MR. GILLMAN: I agree but the witness seems to |
| 19 | Obligations. Do you mean to withdraw all of that? | 19 | be wavering. |
| 20 | A. My testimony, if -- my intended testimony was, | 20 | MR. TRENCH: No, I don't think so |
| 21 | hat the $\$ 5$ million transfer, the transfer of the | 21 | Q. Do you stand by your prior testimony with |
| 2 | intercreditor became due and payable on the closing | 22 | gard to there being dates, required dates, et cetera, |
| 23 |  | 23 | the intercreditor? |
| 24 | Q. Okay. And where do you get or what is the | 24 | MR. TRENCH: I object to the form of the |
|  | basis for your conclusion -- let me ask you this. |  | question. |


|  | 126 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. I believe it's payable on that date. |
| 2 | Q. And where does it say that? Let's pull the |
| 3 | Intercreditor Agreement out. |
| 4 | A. If an obligation becomes due then it's |
| 5 | payable. |
| 6 | Q. Is there a difference between the word due and |
| 7 | the word payable? |
| 8 | MR. TRENCH: Object to the form of the |
| 9 | question. |
| 10 | A. They are two different words. Their |
|  | definitions are probably different. |
| 12 | Q. Let's go on because I think maybe we can |
| 13 | provide you a little bit more clarity. We were talking |
| 14 | about Section 2.2 and liabilities assumed by the |
| 15 | company. And it provides that the company hereby |
| 16 | assumes, agrees to perform and pay all of the |
| 17 | obligations and we have had our discussion about what |
| 18 | obligations are. |
| 19 | Then it goes on to say, "notwithstanding |
| 20 | anything to the contrary, it is understood and agreed |
| 21 | that except for the obligations the FDIC-R, the Initial |
| 22 | Member shall not assign and the Company shall not |
| 23 | assume or be liable for any of the following |
| 24 | liabilities," and they are called the Excluded |
| 25 | Liabilities, right? This is page 15. |

A. Yes.
Q. And then the first one is "any liabilities or obligations of the initial member to the extent attributable to an act, omission or circumstance that occurred or existed prior to the Closing Date and that constitutes a breach or default under any contract, a tort, willful misconduct, fraud or a violation of law by the initial member or the failed bank." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you have indicated and testified at some length that the obligation to pay the $\$ 5$ million became due and payable on October 16, 2009, the Closing Date, right?
A. Yes.
Q. It clearly did not become due or payable
before the Closing Date, right?
A. Well, I think it became due and payable on September 11, 2009.
Q. Okay. So there was -- when the FDIC came in you think that it was due and payable at that time?
A. I think that was a transfer.
Q. And then the FDIC became Senior Lender, right, by defined terms, correct?
A. As a matter of -- I don't know the answer.
Q. Well, the FDIC was the successor, FDIC-R was the successor to Corus Bank, right?
A. Yes.
Q. If it wasn't, there wasn't a transfer, right?
A. Right.
Q. And the successor to Corus Bank is a defined term, Senior Lender, under the Intercreditor Agreement, right?
A. Yes.
Q. There's nothing under -- and then the FDIC-R
as Senior Lender transferred the SB Loan along with the Intercreditor Agreement to CCV on October 16, correct?
A. Did you say as successor lender or as receiver?
Q. It was by definition, as the successor to

Corus Bank it was the Senior Lender, the defined term, under the Intercreditor Agreement, right?
A. Yes, but it was the receiver that transferred the loan to CCV.
Q. The receiver as the successor to Corus was the defined -- was within the defined term Senior Lender in the Intercreditor Agreement, right?
A. But it was the receiver. My position would be that it was the receiver that transferred the loan.
Q. That's a legal position and you are not
here --
A. You are asking me a lot of legal questions.
Q. No, I'm asking you contract documents. Under the contract agreement the FDIC is the successor to Corus Bank, right?

MR. TRENCH: Object to the form of the question. It calls for a legal conclusion.

MR. GILLMAN: You know something, rather than argue on this we will let the judge decide who is what on this.
BY MR. GILLMAN:
Q. Is there anything in the Intercreditor Agreement that says that if the Senior Lender as defined in the intercreditor makes a transfer there's $\$ 5$ million that's due to the junior creditor, right?

MR. TRENCH: What's the question? I object.
Q. The Intercreditor Agreement says that if the

Senior Lender transfers the loan or any of the loan documents without the consent of the Junior Lender, then $\$ 5$ million is due, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there anything in the Intercreditor

Agreement that says that if the Senior Lender transfers it the person who gets it, the transferee, then becomes the Senior Lender under the defined terms and if that

|  | 130 |  | 132 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Senior Lender makes another transfer is there anything | 1 | contrary, "it is understood and agreed that except for |
| 2 | t says there is not another $\$ 5$ million due it? | 2 | Obligations, the Initial Member shall not assign |
| 3 | A. I'm not sure if it is addressed for a | 3 | d and the company shall not assume or be liable for |
| 4 | ccessive transfer. | 4 | any of the following liabilities." |
| 5 | Q. The Intercreditor Agreement, that was | 5 | Q. And those liabilities are called the Excluded |
| 6 | transferred to CCV, right? | 6 | Liabilities, right? |
| 7 | A. Yes. | 7 | A. They are. |
| 8 | Q. CCV accepted the transfer of the | 8 | Q. And they are specified in subparagraph $2.2 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$ |
| 9 | intercreditor, right? | 9 | and C , correct? |
| 10 | A. Yes. | 10 | A. They are. |
| 11 | Q. It accepted all of the rights and benefits | 11 | Q. And there's nothing in here that says the term |
| 12 | under the intercreditor, correct? | 12 | Excluded Liabilities includes anything else than that |
| 13 | A. Yes, I believe so. | 13 | defined term, Excluded Liabilities, right? |
| 14 | Q. I'd like to go back to this term Excluded | 14 | A. The A, B and C are the definitions following |
| 15 | Liabilities because we sort of got off from it. The | 15 | Excluded Liabilities. |
| 16 | Loan, the LCSA, has a specific group of specified | 16 | Q. All right. So under the LCSA the FDIC-R |
| 17 | cumstances that do not create a liability to CCV, | 17 | transferred all of the Obligations as defined |
| 18 | they are defined as the Excluded Liabilities, right? | 18 | associated with the Loan and the Loan Documents to CCV, |
| 19 | MR. TRENCH: Object to the form of the | 19 | CCV accepted all of those Obligations with the |
| 20 | question. Mischaracterizes the agreement. | 20 | exception of those items specifically excluded under |
| 21 | Q. Is it fair to say that the term Excluded | 21 | the term Excluded Liabilities, correct? |
| 22 | Liabilities appears on page 15? | 22 | A. No. |
| 23 | A. Yes. | 23 | Q. How is that no? |
| 24 | Q. And then | 24 | A. Because if something was not an obligation |
| 25 | Liabilities are what is defined as the excluded | 25 | then it was never assumed -- |
|  | 131 |  | 33 |
| 1 | liabilities, correct? | 1 | Q. I already excluded that in my question. |
| 2 | A. Yes. | 2 | A. I'm sorry. |
| 3 | Q. And other than what is written as $2.2 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$ and | 3 | Q. My question is as follows. On October 16, |
| 4 | C, those are the defined Excluded Liabilities under the | 4 | 2009 the closing date of the LCSA, the FDIC-R |
| 5 | LCSA, right? | 5 | transferred to CCV and CCV accepted all things that |
| 6 | A. I think that the implication that those are | 6 | constitute Obligations as that term is defined in the |
| 7 | the only things that are excluded as being a | 7 | agreement, correct? |
| 8 | obligation or a liability of CCV is not correct. | 8 | A. Yes. |
| 9 | Q. Tell me where it says that -- there is a | 9 | Q. And we have already had a long discussion as |
| 10 | defined term called Excluded Liabilities, right? | 10 | to what is included within the term Obligations. Okay? |
| 11 | A. Yes. | 11 | A. Yes. |
| 12 | Q. And the parties to this agreement, being CCV | 12 | Q. Notwithstanding what is otherwise included |
| 13 | and the FDIC as receiver, then set forth three things | 13 | within the defined term Obligations which otherwise |
| 14 | that fell within the defined term Excluded Liabilities, | 14 | would have been transferred and accepted as a liability |
|  | right? | 15 | of CCV, these A, B and C defined as Excluded |
| 16 | A. Well, the first sentence of Section 2.2 says | 16 | Liabilities are excluded, right? |
| 17 | the company hereby assumes and agrees to perform and | 17 | A. Yes. |
| 18 | pay all of the obligations. | 18 | MR. GILLMAN: Let me have a minute. I may be |
| 19 | Q. And we have already had a long discussion | 19 | done. |
| 20 | about what the defined term Obligations means? | 20 | (Recess taken in the proceedings) |
| 21 | A. Yes. | 21 | (Exhibit 19 marked for identification) |
| 22 | Q. Then the company assumed by assuming all of | 22 | BY MR. GILLMAN: |
| 23 | the Obligations as defined, there is then Excluded | 23 | Q. I'm going to give you what has been marked as |
| 24 | Liabilities, a defined term, right? | 24 | Exhibit 19. |
| 25 | A. There's a -- notwithstanding anything to the | 25 | (Exhibit 20 marked for identification). |

## Veritext Florida Reporting Co.

Q. I'm going to give you Exhibit 20.
(Exhibit 21 marked for identification)
Q. I'm going to give you Exhibit 21.
(Exhibit 22 marked for identification)
Q. Here's Exhibit 22.
(Exhibit 23 marked for identification)
Q. And the last one I'm going to give you is Exhibit 23.

Exhibit 19 is the document CCV 5637 to 5643
titled Limited Liability Company Agreement of CCV
Managing Member. Is this the agreement for CCV
Managing Member LLC?
A. I think -- I believe this is the original agreement.
Q. Yes, as of October 16, 2009. Do you see that on the first page?
A. Yes.
Q. And then Exhibit 20, if you would go to that.

This is now an Amended and Restated Limited Liability Company Operating Agreement for Corus Construction Venture dated as of October 16, 2009, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Because at the end of October 16, 2009 you now had what has since been renamed as ST Residential as the 40 percent managing member of CCV, right?
A. I'm not sure what the question was.
Q. The question is, on October 16 you had the sale of the 40 percent interest in CCV, membership interest in CCV to the entity that then became ST Residential, right?
A. That occurred after the Loan Contribution and Sale Agreement.
Q. But on the same day?
A. On the same day.
Q. And this is the operating agreement for the operation after the 40 percent sale, Exhibit 20, right?
A. It was made and effective October 16.
Q. And this was the operating agreement that was intended to apply after CCV, after --
A. ST Residential.
Q. -- after ST Residential became the 40 percent member, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And this document goes from CCV 2390 to 2492, is that right?

MR. TRENCH: The one you gave me goes further than that.
A. Mine goes to 2501 .

MR. TRENCH: The signature page.
MR. GILLMAN: Actually signature pages start
on 2454 , correct. There's an annex and other things that are in there.
Q. One question, if you look at 2455 , Mr.

Alvarado signed on behalf of CCV Managing Member, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And he's somebody who works for Starwood,

Starwood Capital, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Next is Exhibit 21. Is that the First

Amendment to Limited Liability Company Agreement of CCV
Managing Member LLC consisting of CCV 2568 to 2569 ?
A. Yes.
Q. And the purpose of this was to change the
name?
A. Yes.
Q. To ST Residential, LLC?
A. Yes.
Q. Then Exhibit 22, this is a certificate of amendment to the certificate of formation of CCV Managing Member LLC Bates number CCV 2567, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is now done by the owner, the member that owned that entity, Northwest Investments, LLC,
right, to change the name?
A. Yes.
Q. Next, Exhibit 23 is an Amendment to Amended and Restated Limited Liability Company Operating Agreement dated as of March 16, 2010 and that's CCV 24995 to 2501 ?
A. Yes.
Q. The signature on 2501 for ST , whose signature is that?
A. Rich Ryan.
Q. Spell the last name.
A. R-Y-A-N.

MR. GILLMAN: That's all I have. CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ALTSCHUL:
Q. Mr. Solomon, my name is Joseph Altschul. I represent a number of unit purchasers, contract purchasers. I'm going to be asking you questions, some in your capacity with CCV and some based on your having been with Corus Bank at the time that the underlying transaction was entered into.

MR. TRENCH: Just let me make a note for the record, although he was with Corus Bank he was noticed here as a CCV representative, so questions you ask him I'll let him answer to the extent he

```
            1 3 8
    knows that, but he didn't come here with that as an
    intention.
            MR. ALTSCHUL: I can only expect him to answer
    what he knows no matter what it said on the notice
    to the deposition.
BY MR. ALTSCHUL:
    Q. If you can't hear me at any point please let
    me know. If I need to move closer I will. Usually I
    speak loud enough so, hopefully, it won't be a problem.
            A couple of follow-up questions before I get
    into some additional documents. You said Keith Gibbons
    still lives in Chicago, is that right?
    A. To my knowledge he does.
    Q. Do you know who he works for now?
    A. I think he works for a company that's a
    nursing home company.
    Q. Do you know the name?
    A. I don't know the name.
    Q. Do you have his phone number?
    A. I probably do.
    Q. Can you check? You have a BlackBerry or some
    kind of smart phone with you, right?
    A. I would not feel comfortable giving out his
    phone number today, but I could supply it. It is a
    personal phone number. I don't think that would be
    fair to him.
    Q. That's what I'm asking for is a personal phone
    number.
        MR. TRENCH: As opposed to a business number?
    Q. I'm asking for every phone number that you
    have for him, actually. So you don't know the name of
    the company that he works with, correct?
        A. No. It's a company, the principal is Ricky
        Rathner, affiliated with Brickyard Bank.
            MR. STERN:What bank?
            THE WITNESS: Brickyard. I think it is
    Brickyard but it is a separate company.
    Q. Do you know what he's doing for that company?
    A. I think he's chief financial officer.
    Q. Do you know, does he live in Chicago proper or
    is he in one of the surrounding cities?
    A. I think he's in Chicago.
    Q. Do you have Exhibit }10\mathrm{ in front of you?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And if you answered this before I'll apologize
    in advance. Aside from Mr. Trench's cover letter, the
    documents that follow appear to be, I think you
    testified they were the due diligence that was done
    relating to this project and other projects, the Trump
    project and other projects, correct?
```

```
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know when this was prepared?
MR. TRENCH: Which one are you pointing to?
Q. Not the cover letter, but the rest.
A. No, other than what can be gleaned from the documents themselves.
Q. I see on the bottom there is a date of yesterday on there?
A. For the record there are three separate documents.
Q. Let's start with the first one that says Project Northwest. It is the first page after the cover letter.
A. Yes.
Q. And it looks like, at least, there's a handful of pages that go with this. Can you tell me what day that document was prepared?
A. No.
Q. Can you give me an estimate of when that was prepared?
A. No. Before 9/11/2009.
Q. Did you have opportunity to see all of the documents that your attorney produced to Mr. Gillman and to the other parties in this action?
A. No.
Q. You haven't reviewed everything?
A. No.
Q. Are you familiar with the documents that have the CCV Bates stamp that have been produced in a general matter?
A. Generally. It was quite a number, quite a lot of documents.
Q. Where did those documents come from?
A. From the searches of the data sources that we had.
Q. Were all of those documents available to CCV prior to September 11, 2009?
A. A lot of the documents I believe were generated after September 11, 2009.
Q. For all of the documents that predated September 11, 2009 would they have been available to CCV for its due diligence?
A. CCV didn't really exist before September 11, 2009.
Q. Which entity did the due diligence, did you say?
A. The entity that I previously testified to having done due diligence was people that were affiliated with Starwood Capital Group.
Q. What was the name of that entity?
```

|  | 142 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. Starwood Capital Group. |
| 2 | Q. You said they were affiliated with, or it was |
| 3 | Starwood who did the due diligence? |
| 4 | A. Starwood Capital Group is a name of a |
| 5 | different -- of different funds and companies that do |
| 6 | different things and there's people that work in these |
| 7 | different companies and they do things as requested for |
| 8 | the general group. |
| 9 | Q. Were all of the documents that predated |
| 0 | September 11, 2009 that were produced by CCV in this |
| 11 | case that bear the CCV Bates stamp available to |
| 12 | Starwood Capital for its due diligence prior to the |
| 13 | acquisition of the project that brings us all here |
| 1 | today? |
| 15 | A. No. |
| 16 | Q. Which ones were not available? |
| 17 | A. Probably most of them. I don't know which |
| 18 | ones. The government, the FDIC, was deciding what |
| 19 | documents were allowed to be viewed by potential |
| 20 | buyers. |
| 21 | Q. So it is your testimony that the FDIC did not |
| 22 | make all of the documents that we have today that |
| 23 | predated September 11, 2009 available to bidders for |
| 24 | their due diligence? |
| 25 | A. Yes. |
|  | 143 |
| 1 | Q. What is your understanding of Donald Trump's |
| 2 | role in this project? |
| 3 | A. He was a licensee or -- I'm not sure actually |
| 4 | of the right term for his, the use of his name with |
| 5 | respect to the project. |
| 6 | Q. Were you finished? |
| 7 | A. Just to say strike licensee. That's a loose |
| 8 | use of the word. |
| 9 | Q. Did you mean licensor? |
| 0 | A. Yes, licensor but I'm not even sure |
| 11 | technically if he was a licensor. I can't recall what |
| 12 | type of agreement there was for his name to be used. |
| 13 | Q. Did you understand him to be either a |
| 14 | developer or owner of the project? |
| 15 | A. As an officer at Corus Bank did I understand |
| 16 | that? |
| 17 | Q. Yeah, at any time. And if that's changed over |
| 18 | time tell me that as well. |
| 19 | A. The only knowledge I had of the project was as |
| 20 | the subject matter of a loan that we had made, and when |
| 21 | I worked on the loan I believe I knew that he was not a |
| 22 | developer per se. |
| 23 | Q. Did you work on the loan prior to December 15, |
| 24 | 2006 or afterwards, or both? |
| 25 | A. I don't recall when I started working on the |

loan.
Q. December 15,2006 was the loan date, that was the date that the loan was made?
A. Right.
Q. Were you involved with the loan prior to the loan being consummated?
A. Typically a loan closes after months of discussion and underwriting and documentation and negotiation, and I have no idea how many months that was. And I don't recall if I worked on that process or not.

MR. ALTSCHUL: Let's mark Exhibit 24.
(Exhibit 24 marked for identification)
Q. Let me pass down what I have marked as Exhibit

24, a document titled Licensed Agreement. There's three copies and if you can give the one with the sticker to the witness and the other two are for the lawyers. Have you seen this license agreement before?
A. I don't recall it.
Q. This is a license agreement dated the 30th day of June 2004 between Donald Trump and Bay Rock Merrimac LLLP. You don't recall seeing that document before?
A. No.
Q. Do you see the CCV Bates stamp down at the bottom?
A. Yes.
Q. Does it indicate that this document came from CCV or from Corus Bank?
A. Well, it couldn't have come from Corus Bank. Well, do you mean that it may have originated from the files of Corus Bank?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, that's possible.
Q. Any other idea how CCV might have had this document to produce in discovery in this case?
A. No.
Q. In fact you think it did come from the files of Corus Bank, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you don't have any reason to think that this document was not available to Corus Bank when it did its due diligence prior to making the loan to SB Hotel, correct?
A. It was likely available.
Q. I know you said a few minutes ago --

MR. GILLMAN: Joe, let me just comment that I think what you have marked as Exhibit 24 is a license agreement and amendments.

MR. ALTSCHUL: Okay. That's fine. I'll give you the Bates stamp range and whatever it is it is.

```
    The Bates stamp range is CCVPROD }612\mathrm{ through }642
    And there are amendments to it. I see a second
    amendment to it. I see, it is through 641. That's
    fine.
BY MR. ALTSCHUL:
    Q. I know you said that you have not done due
    diligence on projects yourself. Are you familiar with
    what due diligence was done by --
    A. I think I said in acquisition of a company.
    Q. My apology. Were you involved in due
    diligence on loan transactions?
    A. Not generally, no.
    Q. Were you involved or do you know what was done
    for due diligence by Corus Bank during 2006 on loans in
    the $140 million range?
    A. In a very general way. The loan officers did
    the due diligence.
    Q. Explain to me what the due diligence consisted
    of, at least in the general way that you understood it.
    A. Due diligence is trying to understand the
    important aspects of a project in a way that would
    allow you to make a prudent loan.
    Q. So were there certain steps that were
    typically taken as part of that due diligence?
    A. Yes.
```

    Q. Do you know what those were?
    A. Generally we requested the project plans,
    project budget, design information, information about
    sources of the equity investment, information about the
    real estate, about the entitlements, information about
    anything that would be relevant to underwriting the
    project.
    Q. Do you know whether due diligence included an
    examination of signed preconstruction purchase
    agreements?
    A. Presales would be considered. Whether
    individual agreements were reviewed might depend on the
    diligence or the time available to the parties making
    the loan, the loan officers.
        Q. Was generally -- strike that.
            When we talk about presale hotel condominium
        units, was the amount of presales a significant factor
        in making a loan?
            A. It was -- I would characterize it as material
        to the analysis.
            Q. And would the number of units that were sold
        in relation to the number of available units be a
        material fact for Corus Bank to consider?
            A. Any bank would think about the number of
        presales.
    Q. I only want to know about Corus Bank, though.
A. Corus Bank thought about the presales as part of its analysis.
Q. So as an example, if you had about 200 presale contracts out of say 298 units would Corus Bank want to see proof that you actually had 200 presales as a consideration to making its loan?
A. It might. I don't know if it did on this particular loan.
(Exhibit 25 marked for identification).
Q. Let me show you what is marked as Exhibit 25, entitled Hotel Preopening Agreement. Have you seen this Hotel Preopening Agreement before?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. You see that this was produced by CCV, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And would you agree that this would have come from Corus Bank's files?
A. It's likely that it came from Corus Bank's files or we wouldn't have it.
Q. And it is dated June 26, 2006, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And so is this document would have been
available to Corus Bank as part of its due diligence of this loan, isn't that correct?
A. I don't know when it received this document.
Q. So you don't know whether this document was available to Corus Bank for its due diligence prior to making the loan in December 2006?
A. I don't know.
Q. In deciding to make a loan would Corus Bank review or inspect the marketing materials that the developer had put together for the project?
A. Probably not.
Q. That's not something that the developer -strike that. That's not something that Corus Bank as the lender considered to be important?
A. The bank tried to make sure the developer generally had a feasible project, but it didn't try to micromanage how it ran the business.
Q. I don't think I asked you any questions about managing how it ran the business. What my question to you was, is reviewing marketing materials something that Corus Bank does -- did as part of its due diligence?
A. It may have in some loans and it might not have for other loans.
Q. Do you know whether it was done for this loan

```
or not?
    A. I do not.
    Q. Do you know whether this document that we have
    marked as Exhibit 25 was available to the Starwood
    Capital Group as part of its due diligence?
    A. I don't know but I would be surprised if it
    was.
    Q. Why would you be surprised?
    A. I don't think the FDIC generally opened up the
    files of the bank to potential bidders.
            (Exhibit 26 marked for identification)
    Q. Showing you what I am marking as Exhibit 26, a
    document called Pledge of Profits Interest. This is a
    document dated December 15, as of December 15, 2006,
    the closing date, and Corus Bank is actually a party to
    this. Do you see that?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Is this the type of -- was this document
    prepared by Corus Bank?
    A. I can't tell.
    Q. Was a pledge of profits interest something
    that Corus Bank typically received in its loan
    transactions for either condominiums or hotel
    condominiums?
    A. No. Frankly, it is not a collateral agreement
```

    that I recall seeing before.
    Q. You don't recall seeing this pledge of profits
    interest in any other transaction that you worked on?
    A. No.
    Q. Did you work on any other hotel condominium
    projects other than this one?
    A. Not too many.
    Q. Most of yours were straight condo?
    A. More typically, yes.
    Q. And in the other ones that you worked on that
    were hotel-condo, you don't recall seeing this type of
    pledge, correct?
    A. I don't recall it. It was quite a long time
    ago.
        Q. You would agree with me that this document
        again came from CCV -- strike that. You would agree
        that this document came from Corus Bank files, correct?
        A. Yes.
        Q. And you agree that Corus Bank is actually a
        party to this agreement, correct?
            A. They are the assignee.
            Q. So you would agree with me that Corus Bank is
        actually a party to the agreement, correct?
            A. Yes.
            Q. They, actually, as an assignee are receiving a
    benefit; this is an assignment of profits to them, correct?
A. You know, I have not read this agreement carefully, so I am reluctant to characterize exactly what they received. It's likely to be a collateral position, not an actual present assignment.
Q. A collateral position where they would ultimately be the recipient of profits in the event, whatever event is specified in the document occurred, correct?
A. If they exercise remedies under the agreement.
Q. If the conditions occurred and the bank exercised the remedies they would be the beneficiary of this pledge of profits, correct?
A. I don't know what beneficiary means.
Q. It would be the recipient of the profits that are being pledged, correct?
A. I'd have to read the agreement to see if recipient of the profits agreement is the right way to characterize it.
Q. Well, I'm not going to put you through that.
A. Thank you.
(Exhibit 27 marked for identification)
Q. Let me pass you what we have marked as Exhibit 27 and ask you to take a look at it. This is a
document called Hotel Management Agreement between SB Hotel Associates and Trump Florida Management LLC as of July 26, 2006. Do you recall ever seeing this document before?
A. No.
Q. You would agree that this document came from

Corus Bank loan files, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know whether this document was
available to Starwood in its due diligence?
A. I don't know for a fact but I, again, don't
think that the detailed underwriting documents were generally made available.

MR. GILLMAN: Can we take a three minute break?

MR. ALTSCHUL: Sure.
(Recess taken in the proceedings)
(Exhibit 28 marked for identification)
BY MR. ALTSCHUL:
Q. I'm going to show you what's marked as Exhibit

28 and ask you to take a look at it please. Have you
seen number 28 before?
A. I don't know if I've seen it for this loan but

I've seen this type of presentation.
Q. If you would just describe for me what this
appears to be to you, Exhibit 28.
A. It's a loan presentation, I believe.
Q. Do you know who prepared this one?
A. Keith Gibbons, perhaps working with a more junior person.
Q. With who?
A. A more junior person.
Q. Do you know who was the more junior person that worked with Keith on this?
A. On the last page it says, Supporting Loan Officer George Guattare.
Q. Would he be the junior loan officer you just referred to?
A. If he was the supporting loan officer that would be the junior person.
Q. Do you know where George Guattare is today?
A. I think he lives in Chicago and he works for a bank but I'm not sure what bank.
Q. Are you still in contact with him as well?
A. I haven't seen him for a long time but somebody I know had lunch with him.
Q. Do you have his phone number?
A. No.
Q. This document was prepared by the loan officer on the file, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. This would have been prepared by Corus Bank's loan officer, Mr. Gibbons, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Would this document be circulated to a loan committee or how would this be used?
A. It would be presented to a loan committee.
Q. And the loan committee would consider this, what I would say, is a pretty extensive writeup in making a decision whether to make the loan or not?
A. Yes.
Q. This is the kind of document that's prepared before the loan is made, correct?
A. Typically that's what I think it is.
Q. You don't recall ever seeing this document before, correct?
A. I don't recall the specific review of this document. It wasn't my job to review the loan presentations.
Q. Did you sit on the loan committee?
A. No.
Q. Who was on the loan committee that approved this loan?
A. I don't know who was on the loan committee at that time.
Q. In December 2006?
A. It would probably have been Bob Glickman, Michael Stein, and Terry Keenan would be my probable members.
Q. And that's -- so it is a three-person loan committee, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. The loan officers are not part of the loan committee?
A. No.
Q. On the top of this document do you see there's handwriting and I'm not sure what it says. It looks like maybe Tina?
A. Tina Dendrinos.
Q. Who is that?
A. She worked with the bank.
Q. She worked with Corus Bank?
A. Yes.
Q. She was an employee of Corus Bank?
A. Yes.
Q. This document you would agree with me came out of Corus Bank files, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you would agree with me that the FDIC took possession of this document after September 11, 2009,
correct?
A. Yes.
(Exhibit 29 marked for identification)
Q. Let me show you what I have marked as Exhibit 29 and ask you to take a look at that please. Can you identify Exhibit 29 please?
A. It's titled Collateral Assignment of Purchase Agreements with an Irrevocable Power of Attorney.
Q. Is this a document that you typically saw in condominium preconstruction loan transactions?
A. There would be typically a collateral assignment of purchase agreements either individually like this or sometimes it was grouped with other developer interests. For instance, developer's interest in the plans and specs.
Q. And this document was prepared by Corus Bank, correct?
A. It would have been prepared by Corus's attorneys.
Q. And that would have been prior to the closing on December 15, 2006, correct?
A. Typically, yes.
Q. And this document would have come from Corus loan files, correct?
A. Yes.

|  | 158 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q. And this document would have been in the |
| 2 | possession of the FDIC after September 11, 2009, |
| 3 | correct? |
| 4 | A. Yes. |
| 5 | Q. Do you recall seeing this document yourself |
| 6 | prior to today? |
| 7 | A. No. |
| 8 | Q. Would Corus typically undertake any type of |
| 9 | analysis to determine whether representations that are |
| 10 | being made to purchasers are consistent with what they |
| 11 | are told about the loan prior to making the loan? |
| 12 | A. No. |
| 1 | Q. Would Corus typically look at a purchase |
| 14 | agreement and actually review the purchase agreement to |
| 15 | see if it was consistent with their understanding of |
| 16 | the transaction? |
| 17 | A. Again, I think it depends on the loan officer, |
| 18 | how deep they went into things like that. They may |
| 19 | just have superficially reviewed that the purchase |
| 20 | agreements are actual and not fraudulent, not purported |
| 21 | purchase agreements. |
| 2 | Q. I'm sorry. Say that again. |
| 23 | A. They would -- I think some officers would do a |
| 24 | more superficial analysis to determine whether the |
| 25 | purchase agreements were legitimate versus detailed |

analysis of what they say and what was promised. I don't think that was done.
Q. Which type of loan officer -- which type of analysis did Mr. Gibbons typically do?
A. I don't know.
Q. You don't know whether he fell into the more superficial category or the more detailed category?
A. Sometimes it depended on if you were working on one loan or six loans at the same time.
(Exhibit 30 marked for identification)
Q. Let me show you what I have marked as Exhibit 30 and ask you to take a look at that please. Do you recall this document?
A. Yes.
Q. This is a Notice of Default from Trump Marks Fort Lauderdale LLC to SB Hotel Associates, correct?
A. Yes, it appears to be.
Q. And you see you are copied on this document, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall receiving this document in 2009?
A. I vaguely recall that, yes.
Q. Let me ask you. Prior to seeing this letter in 2009 were you aware of any fallout or disagreement between the Trump group and the Stillman group?

MR. GILLMAN: Objection to the form.
Q. You can answer.
A. Can you repeat that question?
Q. I'll try and rephrase it. Prior to receiving this default letter on May 5, 2009 where Trump told SB Hotel that SB Hotel was in default, were you aware of any fallout or breach in the relationship between these two entities?

MR. GILLMAN: Same objection.
Q. You can answer.
A. I'm not sure what fallout is, but I think I was generally aware that nobody, none of the parties were happy with each other.
Q. How were you aware of that and what was the reason that none of the parties were happy with each other?
A. At that time Keith Gibbons was consulting with me, so I was generally being kept aware. I believe the loan was close to maturing, and it was like a lot of loans in 2009, it was stressed. It did not appear that it was going to be paid off at maturity.
Q. And why did you think it was stressed or distressed? I'm not sure what you said.
A. Stressed.
Q. Why did you think it was stressed?
A. Well, maturity was approaching. I don't really remember all of the underlying facts and circumstances, but it wasn't a loan at that time that was going well.
Q. And what was not going well?
A. There had been delay. I don't remember the budget issues. I'm sorry, I really don't have -- I
didn't really prepare for and I don't have that strong a recollection.
Q. You think the issues were generally delay and budget issues?
A. You know, those are two items that I just mentioned, but --
Q. Do you want to take a minute to review that letter and see if it refreshes your recollection?
A. Sure.
(Pause in the proceedings)
Q. Before I come back to that I'm going to give you some more documents and let you just review a couple more letters to help refresh your recollection and then I'll come back and ask you questions on the group of them as opposed to one by one.
(Exhibits 31 and 32 marked for identification)
Q. Let me give you Exhibits 31 and 32 which are the amended complaints filed in the Abercrombie v. SB

|  | 162 |  | 164 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Hotel, et al. and the Todd Fine v. SB Hotel, et al. | 1 | Do these documents, these letters help refresh |
| 2 | MR. ALTSCHUL: If you guys want copies, Steve | 2 | your recollection of what was going on at that time? |
| 3 | and David, I've got copies here. It is up to you. | 3 | A. Yes. |
| 4 | MR. TRENCH: The pleadings? | 4 | Q. Tell me what you recall then, please. |
| 5 | MR. ALTSCHUL: Just pleadings. | 5 | A. Well, I note that there's a series of |
| 6 | Q. The only thing I want to ask you to look at, | 6 | accusations by different parties to the loan, everybody |
| 7 | and you can choose one of them, you don't need to look | 7 | was accusing the other of wrongful conduct. It appears |
| 8 | at both, is if you turn to the very last two pages at | 8 | that the hotel was not likely to be licensed as a |
| 9 | the very end you will see there's a May 13, 2009 | 9 | hotel. It was not finished at that point in time. And |
| 10 | letter. I'm going to ask you to review that letter. I | 10 | apparently SB Hotel sent out a closing notice that said |
| 11 | believe that's from Michelle Conte at SB Hotel | 11 | that if we don't close 50 percent of the units you will |
| 12 | Associates. | 12 | not be able to occupy your unit. |
| 13 | (Pause in the proceedings) | 13 | So -- |
| 14 | A. Okay. | 1 | Q. Was Corus Bank consulted in regard to the |
| 15 | (Exhibit 33 marked for identification) | 1 | closing notice? |
| 16 | Q. I'm going to give you what's marked as Exhibit | 1 | A. No. |
| 17 | 33, which is a May 28, 2009 letter from Trump Marks to | 1 | Q. Corus Bank didn't learn about the closing |
| 18 | Roy Stillman at SB Hotel Associates and ask you to go | 18 | notice until after the fact? |
| 19 | ahead and read that as well. | 19 | A. Correct. |
| 20 | (Exhibit 34 marked for identification) | 20 | Q. Now, at some point there was an effort by at |
| 21 | A. Okay. | 21 | least one unit owner to close, correct? |
| 22 | Q. Let me give you what's marked as Exhibit 34, a | 22 | A. Yes. |
| 23 | May 29, 2009 letter from SB Hotel to Donald Trump at | 23 | Q. And Corus Bank did not agree to that closing, |
| 24 | The Trump Organization. | 24 | correct? |
| 25 | A. Okay. | 25 | A. Yes. |
|  | 163 |  | 165 |
| 1 | (Exhibit 35 marked for identification) | 1 | Q. And Corus Bank essentially did not consent to |
| 2 | Q. Let me hand you number 35 and ask you to take | 2 | SB Hotel recording the condominium documents at that |
| 3 | a look at that please. This is a June 25, 2009 letter | 3 | time, correct? |
| 4 | from Corus Bank to SB Hotel Associates. | 4 | A. I didn't see that. That may be true but I |
| 5 | A. Okay. | 5 | don't recall specifically that we refused to consent to |
| 6 | (Exhibit 36 marked for identification) | 6 | the recording of the docs. We may have refused to sign |
| 7 | Q. Number 36 is an August 11, 2009 letter from SB | 7 | the subordination. I think the borrower can record the |
| 8 | to Keith Gibbons at Corus Bank. | 8 | condominium docs without our signing it, it is just not |
| 9 | MR. TRENCH: Are you going to ask him | 9 | subordinate to the mortgage in that case. |
| 10 | questions about these? | 10 | Q. You don't recall there being any provisions in |
| 11 | MR. ALTSCHUL: I'm going to ask him questions | 11 | the loan agreement that the condo docs had to be |
| 12 | about them as a group and hoping that it will | 12 | approved by Corus Bank? |
| 13 | refresh his recollection. | 13 | A. That would be typical. |
| 14 | A. Okay. | 14 | Q. And if Corus Bank didn't give that approval is |
| 15 | Q. Last but not least, number 37, which is an | 15 | it your testimony that the borrower can go ahead and |
| 16 | August 13, 2009 letter from Corus Bank to SB Hotel | 16 | record the condo docs anyway? |
| 17 | Associates. | 17 | A. They could. It would be a default under the |
| 18 | (Exhibit 37 marked for identification) | 18 | loan, but there's going to be defaults under the loan |
| 19 | A. Okay. | 19 | in any event. |
| 20 | Q. First, with respect to where we left off in | 20 | Q. Is there any reason why Corus Bank couldn't |
| 21 | your testimony before I showed you the rest of the | 21 | have just extended the loan? |
| 22 | exhibits I asked you, really I showed those to you to | 22 | A. There could be many reasons why they couldn't. |
| 23 | see if it would refresh your recollection as to why the | 23 | I mean, extending the loan is an independent credit |
| 24 | loan wasn't going well, I think was what was your | 24 | decision. |
| 25 | testimony was. | 25 | Q. Let me ask differently. Could Corus Bank have |
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extended the loan?
A. I can't -- that would require me to speculate on what's conceivable, something that didn't happen, whether it is conceivable.
Q. Was it considered at the time?
A. I don't recall a discussion about extending the loan.
Q. Do you recall SB Hotel asking for a loan extension?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. All the documents that I've given to you, all of these exhibits come from the Corus Bank loan files, correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. And all of these documents were in possession of the FDIC after September 11, 2009, correct?
A. Yes to the -- I'll point out that the FDIC didn't know what they had in their files.
Q. How do you know that?
A. They came in, they had a thousand things to get their arms around. So --
Q. Did the FDIC did not have enough resources to try and learn what they had?
A. They had quite a number of resources, but there's a bank with billions of dollars in assets.

There's things you do first and there's things you do second.
Q. You would agree that the FDIC had all of these documents, it was just a question of what priority they put on what they wanted to review, correct?
A. I would agree that these documents were in the files, but I don't think they had an immediate designated file reader, but I could be wrong.
Q. Where were you at that time, September 9, 2009, were you still with Corus Bank?
A. On the second floor.
Q. And where were you on September 10, 2009?
A. On the second floor.
Q. So you stayed with Corus Bank until when?
A. Until October 16, 2009.
Q. Where was the physical possession of these documents after September 11, 2009?
A. All, the vast majority of the documents were part of a big operation to be packaged in cellophanesurrounded boxes and shipped to Atlanta to Trimont.
Q. And when did that happen, over what period of time?
A. Immediately. That started happening --
Q. About how long did that take?
A. It took weeks.
Q. And when in that process were the loan documents relating to this file sent to Atlanta?
A. Oh, I have no idea. They were all in file rooms in the basement, and the basement was taken over by the FDIC and the files were systematically wrapped and shipped to Atlanta.
Q. Did the FDIC do any review of documents in the basement?
A. No, they were wrapping and shipping.
Q. You don't know what order they wrapped and shipped?
A. No.
Q. Do you know what the review process was once they got to Atlanta?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever go to the operation in Atlanta and see how many people they assigned and what they were reviewing?
A. No.

Just fair notice, in 30 minutes I'm going to have to walk out the door.
Q. If we are not done by then we will deal with that however we have to but I appreciate your fair notice.

Do you know who Jim Petros is?
A. No.
Q. How about Jason Greenblatt?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever had any communication with
anybody from The Trump Organization or anyone on behalf
of Donald Trump relating to this project?
A. I was involved in one phone call with Donald and Ivanka.
Q. Approximately when was that?
A. I don't remember.
Q. Was it before September 11, 2009?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it before the loan was made in December of 2006?
A. No. It was closer to the end.
Q. Tell me what you recall about that phone call.
A. I recall Donald pitching the bank on, that
they are creative thinkers and could provide some services.
Q. Who was the they that you are referring to?
A. His company.
Q. The Trump Organization?
A. Right.
Q. So Donald was pitching The Trump Organization to the bank?

|  | 170 |  | 172 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. It was a sales call. | 1 | that somebody showed up. |
| 2 | Q. For what | 2 | Q. And what happened? |
| 3 | A. For whatever might come in the future. | 3 | A. Well, we sent the letter saying that we are |
| 4 | Q. It didn't relate to this project? | 4 | not going to issue a release of our mortgage. |
| 5 | A. Well, it related to this project generally | 5 | Q. Prior to that time? |
| 6 | saying, perhaps we can help. | 6 | A. No, I think it was, maybe it was right around |
| 7 | Q. How was Donald suggesting he could help? | 7 | that day. Let's see. It was five days before. We |
| 8 | A. It was nothing specific. It was really | 8 | sent a letter on June 25 based on a request for a |
| 9 | salesmanship. | 9 | closing on June 30. And if I'm saying we, by that I |
| 10 | Q. Was Donald suggesting that the bank should | 10 | mean Corus Bank |
|  | foreclose on the project and then turn it over to | 11 | Q. I understand. Did you say in the letter that |
| 12 | Donald? | 12 | you weren't going to close, you weren't going to give |
| 13 | A. No, I don't remember anything specific like | 13 | the release? |
| 14 | that. | 14 | A. The letter states in the last paragraph, |
| 15 | Q. What type of help were they offering? Were | 15 | "Based on the probable loss that most of the contract |
| 16 | they offering to make the loan payments? | 16 | purchasers and the potential loss of the Trump flag for |
| 17 | A. Just that they were creative thinkers and good | 17 | the hotel, the bank intends to carefully study the |
| 18 | property managers. | 18 | possible approaches" -- that was the wrong part. |
| 19 | Q. Were they still interested in participating in | 19 | Didn't specifically say that. |
| 20 | he management of this project at that time? | 20 | We said, "In view of the simple facts |
| 2 | A. It really was not a detailed-type discussion. | 21 | scribed in this letter it is the bank's business |
| 22 | It was a marketing call. | 22 | judgment that allowing one closing and thus investing a |
| 23 | Q. So they certainly didn't tell you that they | 23 | single contract purchaser with irrevocable rights of |
| 24 | wanted out of the project at that point, did they? | 24 | ownership in a minute fraction of the project the day |
| 25 | A. We didn't discuss the loan in a specific way. | 25 | prior to loan maturity is not a prudent business |
|  | 171 |  | 173 |
| 1 | Q. Let me ask my question again. They didn't | 1 | decision. It will not materially reduce the amounts |
| 2 | tell you they wanted out of the project at that time, | 2 | due to the bank and it will not adversely affect the |
| 3 |  | 3 | orrower or the Junior Lender. In addition, we believe |
| 4 | A. I really don't remember whether it was before | 4 | t is legally improper to close on a unit when you are |
| 5 | or after they had sent their notice regarding the | 5 | not prepared to deliver the product, a functioning |
| 6 | revocation of their license. | 6 | hotel, promised in the offering material." |
| 7 | Q. So you don't recall whether the idea of The | 7 | Q. What are you reading from, which letter, which |
| 8 | Trump Organization and Donald Trump leaving the project | 8 | exhibit? |
| 9 | was discussed during your phone call with Donald and | 9 | A. The letter that is marked as Exhibit 35, the |
| 10 | Ivanka, correct? | 10 | second to the last paragraph. |
|  | A. Well, if it was after they had sent the letter | 11 | Q. So back to the purchaser who wanted to close. |
| 12 | revoking the license I just don't remember that bei | 12 | ou understood he showed up at the closing office, |
| 13 | part of the conversation. | 13 | correct? |
| 14 | Q. Do you recall in th | 14 | A. Hearsay. I heard. Actually I don't know. |
| 15 | issue of, I think you said you remembered a minute ago | 15 | Q. Do you know what happened with that guy? |
| 16 | somebody who wanted to close, do you recall that? | 16 | A. I do not know. |
| 17 | A. Yes. | 17 | Q. Do you know whether he was given his money |
| 18 | Q. That was unit 1412? | 18 | back? |
| 19 | A. That's what I was told | 19 | A. I do not know |
| 20 | Q. What do you recall about that? | 20 | Q. Who would know that? |
| 21 | A. I recall that somebody wanted to close on the | 21 | A. Whoever was at the office, at the closing |
| 22 | last day of the loan term. | 22 | office if the person showed up. |
| 23 | Q. Do you know whether the buyer showed up at the | 23 | Q. The closing agent? |
| 24 | offices of the closing agent? | 24 | A. Title offices. Whoever was there. |
| 25 | A. I don't have any actual knowledge but I'm told | 25 | Q. Was somebody from Corus Bank part of the title |
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office, one of the title officers for that project?
A. No.
Q. You see on there in the series of letters there's discussions about problems with the construction loan and financing. Did Corus Bank ever deny financing or construction draws to SB Hotel?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Is it your understanding that Corus Bank fully performed its obligations under the construction loan?
A. It typically did fulfill its obligations but I don't recall on this loan. Oftentimes in construction loans you get a draw request from a borrower which does not meet the requirements of the loan agreement and there is delay while certain things are, requirements are met.
Q. Do you know whether the construction loan was supposed to pay for the buildout of the spa and the restaurant at the project?
A. I do not know.
Q. You were asked some questions by Mr. Gillman about the current intent of the owner -- of the lender upon successful foreclosure and I believe you said that the lender, the owner of the loan now, will operate the project, correct?
A. Most likely.
Q. In what manner are they considering operating the project?
A. I think that right now the focus is on completing the enforcement action that's ongoing, and the business people are thinking about what future uses might be productive.
Q. Are they considering going forward as a hotel condominium?
A. I'm sure they are considering all possible uses of the property.
Q. Do you know whether that is being considered as one of the possible uses of the property?
A. I would think that it is being considered as a possible use of the property.
Q. Has CCV decided whether it is willing to close if purchasers came along today and said, Hey, I want to buy a unit?
A. At this time we are foreclosing the contracts.
Q. That part I understand. That's why we are here today.
A. Right. So the answer would be no, based on the fact that we are foreclosing out the purchasers' rights under the contracts.
Q. You are foreclosing out the purchasers' rights under the contracts or you are trying to foreclose any
claims they may have for an interest in the building?
A. Both.
Q. Are you sure about that?
A. No.
Q. In Exhibit 36 you saw SB Hotel claiming --
A. Let me correct that.
Q. Go ahead.
A. Whatever rights the purchasers have against the original borrower remain. We are trying to foreclose their interest in the property.
Q. Let me ask you with respect to Exhibit 36, the SB letter to Corus Bank that claims a series of defaults. It is August 11, 2009.
A. Yes.
Q. Any of those allegations true?
A. I doubt it.
Q. So you think that SB Hotel is wrong in making all those allegations against Corus Bank?
A. I think that this letter was prepared as posturing a position for expected future litigation.
Q. Did anybody ever tell you that from SB Hotel?
A. No.
Q. That's just your opinion based on reading the letter?
A. Yes.
Q. Why isn't anything being done currently to build out the restaurant or the spa?
A. Because we don't own the property, we being Corus Construction Venture, the lender that's foreclosing on it.
Q. Has there been any discussions with the current owner about taking steps to complete the project over, say, the last two years while this building has been sitting there empty?
A. Any discussions we have had with the borrower are confidential pursuant to a mediation that took place.
Q. I'm not asking about the mediation agreement. Other than the mediation agreement, any discussions with the current owner of the property over the last two years about building out the spa or the restaurant and completing the project?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Are you aware of any current discussions with

Trump or The Trump Organization about becoming involved with the project once again?
A. No.
Q. Any discussions during the last two years to
that extent?
A. No.

|  | 178 |  | 180 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q. One question that I said earlier and I think I | 1 | A. I doubt it. |
| 2 | stated it incorrectly. With respect to all the | 2 | Q. Well, the FDIC had employed you, correct? |
| 3 | exhibits that we have seen that have the CCV Bates | 3 | A. Yes. |
| 4 | stamp, all of those documents came from Corus Bank | 4 | Q. The FDIC had employed the Corus loan officer |
| 5 | files and went to the FDIC, correct? | 5 | with regard to the SB loan, correct? |
| 6 | A. If Corus Construction Venture has possession | 6 | A. Yes, through a subcontractor. |
| 7 | of them now they had to have been transferred to Corus | 7 | Q. And the loan officer was clearly aware of the |
| 8 | Construction Venture by the FDIC as receiver. | 8 | Intercreditor Agreement and its terms and requirements, |
| 9 | Q. Who would have received those documents from | 9 | right? |
| 10 | Corus Bank, correct? | 10 | A. I can't speak to what the loan officer knew |
| 11 | A. When it took over Corus Bank. | 11 | about the Intercreditor Agreement. |
| 12 | Q. So the answer was yes, correct? | 12 | Q. The Intercreditor Agreement was specifically |
| 13 | A. Yes. | 13 | referenced and assigned to CCV by FDIC-R on October 16, |
| 14 | MR. ALTSCHUL: Let's take about a three minute | 14 | 2009, correct? |
| 15 | break. I might be done. Let me review my notes | 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | and see if we are done. | 16 | Q. So that document was fully available for |
| 17 | (Recess taken in the proceedings) | 17 | whatever review and examination FDIC or CCV wanted to |
| 18 | MR. ALTSCHUL: Back on. | 18 | make of it, correct? |
| 19 | (Exhibit 38 marked for identification) | 19 | A. It was in the files. |
| 2 | BY MR. ALTSCHUL: | 20 | Q. You were asked questions about Exhibit 35. |
| 2 | Q. Let me show to you what I have marked as | 21 | Could you pull that up in front of you. Exhibit 35 is |
| 2 | Exhibit 38. And this will be a composite exhibit. | 22 | a letter that was sent to SB Hotel Associates on June |
| 23 | This is a composite of letters from my law firm to | 23 | 25,2009, is that right? |
| 24 | Sheila Bair, Thomas Curry, Martin Greenberg, and | 24 | A. Yes. |
| 25 | Mitchell Glassman. They are all dated August 31, 2009. | 25 | Q. Who authored this letter? |
|  | 179 |  | 181 |
| 1 | Are you familiar with these letters, sir? | 1 | A. Keith Gibbons. |
| 2 | A. No. | 2 | Q. Keith Gibbons signed it. Who authored it? |
| 3 | Q. Never seen them before? | 3 | A. I played a role in advising on the contents of |
| 4 | A. I see one letter -- | 4 | the letter. |
| 5 | Q. After the exhibits then you will see the | 5 | Q. In this letter you or Mr. Gibbons or whoever |
| 6 | second, third and fourth letter. | 6 | participated on behalf of Corus says at the end of the |
| 7 | A. I don't recall sees these letters. It's | 7 | first page, "in addition we believe it legally" -- |
| 8 | possible that I did, though, and was asked to respond. | 8 | MR. TRENCH: Which page are you on? |
| 9 | MR. ALTSCHUL: I don't have any further | 9 | MR. GILLMAN: The end of the second over to |
| 10 | questions. | 10 | the second. |
| 11 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION | 11 | Q. "In addition, we believe it is legally |
| 12 | BY MR. GILLMAN: | 12 | improper to close on a unit when you are not prepared |
| 13 | Q. I have a couple and we'll get you out of here. | 13 | to deliver the product, a functioning hotel, promised |
| 14 | You were asked some questions with regard to what | 14 | in the offering materials." Do you see that? |
| 15 | information Starwood had. I want to go back to the | 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | issue of what information CCV and the FDIC had. | 16 | Q. I would like you to get in front of you again |
| 17 | It's correct, isn't it, that specifically with | 17 | Exhibit 10 and go to the site review and go to the |
| 18 | regard to the SB Loan Documents and the Intercreditor | 18 | bottom. There's a statement there with regard to |
| 19 | Agreement, CCV was well aware of the Intercreditor | 19 | extensive legal analysis by Corus Bank to the |
| 20 | Agreement prior to October 16, 2009, correct? | 20 | conclusion that the loss of the Trump flag or the |
| 21 | A. CCV didn't exist before October 16. | 21 | inability to open as a hotel did not release the |
| 22 | Q. Actually it did. It existed on October 13, | 22 | contract purchasers from any obligations under the |
| 23 | but be that as it may. As of the date of its existence | 23 | contracts, right? |
| 24 | the FDIC was well aware of the Intercreditor Agreement, | 24 | A. It says -- |
| 25 |  | 25 | Q. Why don't you read into the record what it |

says?
A. It says "Corus's extensive legal review of the sales contracts leads them to believe that the loss of the Trump flag and the failure to open as a hotel does not release the buyers from their contracts."
Q. So as of 2009, at least, sometime prior to October 16, 2009, a statement by the Starwood due diligence people that the extensive legal analysis by Corus Bank had caused them to conclude that the loss of the Trump flag or the failure to open as a hotel would not release the contract purchasers from their obligations, right? That's what it says?
A. It says that.
Q. Where did that information come from?
A. I don't know.
Q. Who at Corus did that legal analysis?
A. I don't know if it was done by Corus.
Q. Well, doesn't it say Corus's extensive legal analysis?
A. Yes.
Q. So can you tell me why Corus had done extensive legal analysis that wouldn't be a default or impairment to the contracts but in the letter sent by Corus to SB it says that it would?

MR. TRENCH: Object to form.
inspection based on the language in one of these documents which says they reviewed the property but couldn't get inside.

MR. GILLMAN: Subject to, and as I said before, I don't think I've gotten a response or an answer as to whether I have gotten all the due diligence material. I do believe that it is within the possession, custody or control of CCV through its managing member, and so I'm adjourning subject to that and whatever documents may come in relating to that.

MR. ALTSCHUL: The only thing I would add is I had asked about Mr. Gibbons' phone number. I hope I don't have to take it to the court to get it. I think I'm entitled to it and I don't think you have a basis for not providing it. Nevertheless I'll extend the courtesy of you making whatever phone call you need to make and hopefully it won't have to be brought to the court.

MR. TRENCH: Before we --
MR. GILLMAN: Off the record. Do you have any questions?

MR. TRENCH: No.
MR. GILLMAN: This is being ordered so you will be afforded the right to read or you can waive 185
that.
MR. TRENCH: He'll read and I'll get a copy.
MR. GILLMAN: I would like to get a rough.
MR. ALTSCHUL: We'll take a copy as well.
MR. TRENCH: I'll take a copy of whatever he gets.

MR. ALTSCHUL: And mini and electronic.
(Deposition concluded 5:01 p.m.)
(Reading and signing not waived)
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